DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 323 891 HE 023 898

AUTHOR James, Olive C. R., Ed.; Matson, Hollis N., Ed.
TITLE University Commission on Human Relations: Focusing on Racism & Other Forms of Discrimination. Final Report. Volume VII: Staff/Administrator Survey and Frequencies.
INSTITUTION San Francisco State Univ., CA. Univ. Commission on Human Relations.
PUB DATE May 90
NOTE 201p.; This report is in seven volumes, see HE 023 892-897. Occasional illegible pages.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Advisory Committees; Cultural Differences; Disabilities; *Educational Discrimination; Ethnic Discrimination; Handicap Discrimination; Higher Education; *Human Relations; Racial Differences; Racial Discrimination; Religious Differences; Religious Discrimination; Sex Discrimination; Staff Role; State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *San Francisco State University CA

ABSTRACT

Almost 400 staff and administrators at the San Francisco State University were surveyed concerning campus human relations. This volume provides a copy of the survey questionnaire and frequency distributions for responses to each questionnaire item. The questionnaire covered: treatment of various groups by the campus community; frequency of being offended, abused, or experiencing discrimination; observation of discrimination; experience with sexual harassment; treatment of various groups in hiring decisions and appointments to management positions; managers' role in recruiting minority staff and reducing intolerance; attitudes toward affirmative action programs; factors limiting recruitment of new staff or managers; adequacy of grievance procedures; age; gender; collective bargaining unit; degrees held; disability; ethnic or racial identification; permanent/temporary status; religious preference; and sexual orientation. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 233891

FINAL REPORT OF THE
UNIVERSITY COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS:
FOCUSING ON RACISM & OTHER FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION

VOLUME VII

STAFF/ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY AND FREQUENCIES

HE 023 898

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
SAN FRAN STATE UNIV.
Comm on Human Relations
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Table of Contents

Final Report of the University Commission on Human Relations:
Focusing on Racism & Other Forms of Discrimination
May 1990

Volume VII

Staff/Administrator Survey and Frequencies

SELECTED FINDINGS

from the

SFSU HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

STAFF SURVEY

January-March, 1990

Principal Investigators:

Richard DeLeon
James Newton
Robert Smith

May 10, 1990

Public Research Institute
San Francisco State University

SELECTED FINDINGS

from the

SFSU HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

STAFF SURVEY

March-April, 1990

PARTS 1-8

Principal Investigators:

Richard DeLeon
James Newton
Robert Smith

May 10, 1990

Public Research Institute
San Francisco State University

CONTENTS

PART 1: SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

PART 2: REPORTED FREQUENCY OF ABUSE (Q2)

PART 3: REPORTED FREQUENCY OF ABUSE -- TYPES (Q3 & Q4)

PART 4: REPORTED SEXUAL HARASSMENT (Q5 & Q6)

PART 5: STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF MANAGERIAL RESPONSIVENESS TO HUMAN RELATIONS ISSUES (Q9, Q10, Q13A, Q13H, Q11)

PART 6: STAFF KNOWLEDGE OF AND SATISFACTION WITH GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES (Q14, Q15)

PART 7: STAFF AWARENESS OF HRC (Q27, Q27A, Q27B)

PART 8: STAFF OPINIONS ON HUMAN RELATIONS ISSUES (Q13A-Q13H)

PART 1

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Table 1: Sample breakdown by race/ethnicity 1
Table 2: Sample race/ethnicity (recoded) 1
Table 3: Sample breakdown by gender 1
Table 4: Sample breakdown by disability status 1
Table 5: Sample breakdown by sexual identity 2
Table 6: Sample breakdown by management/non-management status 2
Table 7: Sample breakdown by permanent/part-time status 2
Table 8: Comparisons of sample and total staff population 3

TABLE 1: SAMPLE BREAKDOWN BY RACE/ETHNICITY (Q24)

q24		Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Filipino	0	20	5.25	5.25
Asian	1	43	11.29	16.54
Pac.Isldr	2	3	0.79	17.32
Mex.Amer.	3	10	2.62	19.95
Hispanic	4	24	6.30	26.25
Amer.Ind.	5	4	1.05	27.30
Black	6	48	12.60	39.90
White	7	201	52.76	92.65
Other	8	28	7.35	100.00
Total		381	100.00	(18 refused to answer)

TABLE 2: SAMPLE RACE/ETHNICITY (RECODED)

race	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
asian	66	17.32	17.32
hispanic	34	8.92	26.25
black	48	12.60	38.85
white	201	52.76	91.60
other	32	8.40	100.00
Total	381	100.00	

TABLE 3: SAMPLE BREAKDOWN BY GENDER (Q16)

sex	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Male	153	39.13	39.13
Female	238	60.87	100.00
Total	391	100.00	

TABLE 4: SAMPLE BREAKDOWN BY DISABILITY STATUS (Q22)

disabled	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
yes	21	5.57	5.57
no	356	94.43	100.00
Total	377	100.00	

TABLE 5: SAMPLE BREAKDOWN BY SEXUAL IDENTITY (Q26)

gaybi	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gay/Bi	62	16.85	16.85
Straight	306	83.15	100.00
Total	368	100.00	

TABLE 6: SAMPLE BREAKDOWN BY MANAGEMENT/NON-MANAGEMENT STATUS (Q18)

manage	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Managemt	48	12.63	12.63
NonMgmt	332	87.37	100.00
Total	380	100.00	

TABLE 7: SAMPLE BREAKDOWN BY PERMANENT/PART-TIME STATUS (Q19)

Permanent Status?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
yes	306	78.87	78.87
no	82	21.13	100.00
Total	388	100.00	

TABLE 8: COMPARISONS OF SAMPLE AND TOTAL STAFF POPULATION:

8A: Race/Ethnicity

	TOTAL	SAMPLE	SAMPLE (*)
Black	11.5%	12.6%	13.6%
Asian	20.4%	17.3%	18.6%
Hispanic	7.6%	8.9%	9.6%
White	59.9%	52.8%	57.0%
Nat.Amer.	.5%	1.0%	1.1%
Other	___	7.3%	___

(*) Excluding self-identifed "other race" from sample.

8B. Gender

	TOTAL	SAMPLE
Male	45%	39%
Female	55%	61%

8C. Management Status

	TOTAL	SAMPLE
Management (*)	12.0%	12.6%
Non-Management	88.0%	87.4%

(*) Collective Bargaining Unit 10 - Q18.

PART 2

REPORTED FREQUENCY OF ABUSE (Q2)

Table 1A: Reported frequency of abuse based on gender 1
Table 1B: Reported frequency by sex 1
Table 1C: Reported frequency by management status 2
Table 2A: Reported frequency of abuse based on race/ethnicity 2
Table 2B: Reported frequency by race/ethnicity 3
Table 2C: Reported frequency by management status 3
Table 3A: Reported frequency of abuse based on sexual orientation 4
Table 3B: Reported frequency by sexual identity 4
Table 3C: Reported frequency by management status 5
Table 4A: Reported frequency of abuse based on religious beliefs 5
Table 4B: Reported frequency by religious faith 6
Table 4C: Reported frequency by management status 6
Table 5A: Reported frequency of abuse based on disability 7
Table 5B: Reported frequency by disability 7
Table 5C: Reported frequency by management status 8
Table 6A: Reported frequency of abused based on national origins 8
Table 6B: Reported frequency by race 9
Table 6C: Reported frequency by management status 9

BREAKDOWNS AND ANALYSES OF RESPONSES TO Q2:

"As a staff/administrator at SFSU, how often, if at all, have you been offended, put down, or physically or emotionally abused in any way by other members of the campus community on the basis of your ... ?

TABLE 1A: REPORTED FREQUENCY OF ABUSE BASED ON GENDER

Abused based on gender?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	183	46.92	46.92
Rarely	78	20.00	66.92
Sometime	102	26.15	93.08
Often	27	6.92	100.00
Total	390	100.00	

TABLE 1B: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY SEX

Abused based on gender?	sex: Male	Female	Total
Never	88	90	178
	58.67	38.46	46.35
Rarely	33	45	78
	22.00	19.23	20.31
Sometime	25	77	102
	16.67	32.91	26.56
Often	4	22	26
	2.67	9.40	6.77
Total	150	234	384
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 23.5940 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

ABLE 1C: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Abused based on gender?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Never	24 50.00	149 45.57	173 46.13
Rarely	9 18.75	66 20.18	75 20.00
Sometime	13 27.08	87 26.61	100 26.67
Often	2 4.17	25 7.65	27 7.20
Total	48 100.00	327 100.00	375 100.00

chi2(3) = 0.9284 Prob>chi2 = 0.819

ABLE 2A: REPORTED FREQUENCY OF ABUSE BASED ON RACE/ETHNICITY

Abused based on race/ethnicity?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	190	48.47	48.47
Rarely	87	22.19	70.66
Sometime	98	25.00	95.66
Often	17	4.34	100.00
Total	392	100.00	

ABLE 2B: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY RACE/ETHNICITY

Abused based on ace/ethnicity?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Never	20	13	5	127	16	181
	30.77	38.24	10.42	64.14	50.00	48.01
Rarely	17	9	12	43	5	86
	26.15	26.47	25.00	21.72	15.63	22.81
Sometime	23	9	23	28	10	93
	35.38	26.47	47.92	14.14	31.25	24.67
Often	5	3	8	0	1	17
	7.69	8.82	16.67	0.00	3.13	4.51
Total	65	34	48	198	32	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 81.7410 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

TABLE 2C: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Abused based on race/ethnicity?	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Never	21	159	180
	43.75	48.48	47.87
Rarely	16	67	83
	33.33	20.43	22.07
Sometime	8	88	96
	16.67	26.83	25.53
Often	3	14	17
	6.25	4.27	4.52
Total	48	328	376
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 5.4126 Prob>chi2 = 0.144

TABLE 3A: REPORTED FREQUENCY OF ABUSE BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION

Abused based on sexual identity	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	274	70.26	70.26
Rarely	59	15.13	85.38
Sometime	43	11.03	96.41
Often	14	3.59	100.00
Total	390	100.00	

TABLE 3B: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

Abused based on sexual identity	gaybi		
	Gay/Bi	Straight	Total
Never	20	237	257
	33.33	78.22	70.80
Rarely	12	41	53
	20.00	13.53	14.60
Sometime	22	19	41
	36.67	6.27	11.29
Often	6	6	12
	10.00	1.98	3.31
Total	60	303	363
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 66.3986 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

ABLE 3C: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Abused based on sexual identity	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Never	35	226	261
	72.92	69.33	69.79
Rarely	7	51	58
	14.58	15.64	15.51
Sometime	5	37	42
	10.42	11.35	11.23
Often	1	12	13
	2.08	3.68	3.48
Total	48	326	374
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 0.4474 Prob>chi2 = 0.930

ABLE 4A: REPORTED FREQUENCY OF ABUSE BASED ON RELIGIOUS BELIEFS

Abused based on Relig. Faith?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	301	78.18	78.18
Rarely	62	16.10	94.29
Sometime	17	4.42	98.70
Often	5	1.30	100.00
Total	385	100.00	

TABLE 4B: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY RELIGIOUS FAITH

Abused based on Relig. Faith?	relig					
	Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
Never	136	9	2	98	33	278
	74.32	50.00	100.00	83.76	82.50	77.22
Rarely	35	7	0	16	3	61
	19.13	38.89	0.00	13.68	7.50	16.94
Sometime	9	2	0	2	3	16
	4.92	11.11	0.00	1.71	7.50	4.44
Often	3	0	0	1	1	5
	1.64	0.00	0.00	0.85	2.50	1.39
Total	183	18	2	117	40	360
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 17.4128 Prob>chi2 = 0.135

TABLE 4C: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Abused based on Relig. Faith?	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Never	36	253	289
	78.26	78.09	78.11
Rarely	7	53	60
	15.22	16.36	16.22
Sometime	2	15	17
	4.35	4.63	4.59
Often	1	3	4
	2.17	0.93	1.08
Total	46	324	370
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 0.6198 Prob>chi2 = 0.892

ABLE 5A: REPORTED FREQUENCY OF ABUSE BASED ON DISABILITY

Abused based on disability?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	332	87.83	87.83
Rarely	31	8.20	96.03
Sometime	10	2.65	98.68
Often	5	1.32	100.00
Total	378	100.00	

ABLE 5B: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY DISABILITY

Abused based on disability?	disabled yes	no	Total
Never	9	307	316
	45.00	90.03	87.53
Rarely	4	26	30
	20.00	7.62	8.31
Sometime	4	6	10
	20.00	1.76	2.77
Often	3	2	5
	15.00	0.59	1.39
Total	20	341	361
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 58.8858 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

ABLE 5C: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Abused based on isability?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Never	40 86.96	281 88.09	321 87.95
Rarely	5 10.87	25 7.84	30 8.22
Sometime	1 2.17	8 2.51	9 2.47
Often	0 0.00	5 1.57	5 1.37
Total	46 100.00	319 100.00	365 100.00

chi2(3) = 1.1949 Prob>chi2 = 0.754

ABLE 6A: REPORTED FREQUENCY OF ABUSE BASED ON NATIONAL ORIGINS

bused based on national origin	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	275	71.06	71.06
Rarely	55	14.21	85.27
Sometime	49	12.66	97.93
Often	8	2.07	100.00
Total	387	100.00	

ABLE 6B: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY RACE

Abused based on national origin	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Never	33	16	30	163	22	264
	51.56	50.00	63.83	82.74	68.75	70.97
Rarely	15	6	6	24	3	54
	23.44	18.75	12.77	12.18	9.38	14.52
Sometime	13	8	10	9	7	47
	20.31	25.00	21.28	4.57	21.88	12.63
Often	3	2	1	1	0	7
	4.69	6.25	2.13	0.51	0.00	1.88
Total	64	32	47	197	32	372
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 45.3715 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

TABLE 6C: REPORTED FREQUENCY BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Abused based on national origin	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Never	37	229	266
	77.08	70.90	71.70
Rarely	7	44	51
	14.58	13.62	13.75
Sometime	3	45	48
	6.25	13.93	12.94
Often	1	5	6
	2.08	1.55	1.62
Total	48	323	371
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 2.2312 Prob>chi2 = 0.526

PART 3

REPORTED FREQUENCY OF ABUSE -- TYPES (Q3 & Q4)

Table 1: Q3A & Q4A "Negative remarks by co-workers 1
Table 2: Q3B & Q4B "Negative Remarks by Faculty" 2
Table 3: Q3C & Q4C "Negative Remarks by Managers" 2
Table 4: Q3D & Q4D "Social behavior by co-workers that tends to exclude" 3
Table 5: Q3E & Q4E "Behavior by students that expresses negative attitudes" 3
Table 6: Q3F & Q4F "Behavior by staff or co-workers that expresses negative attitudes" 4
Table 7: Q3G & Q4G "Departmental patterns ...that tend to exclude or disadvantage" 4
Table 8: Q3H & Q4H "Less desirable work assignments 5
Table 9: Q3I & Q4I "Inequitable approaches to hiring, retention.." 5
Table 10A: Q3G by race/ethnicity 6
Table 10B: Q3H by race/ethnicity 6
Table 10C: Q3I by race/ethnicity 7
Table 11A: Q3G by gender 7
Table 11B: Q3H by gender 8
Table 11C: Q3I by gender 8
Table 12A: Q3G by sexual identity 9
Table 12B: Q3H by sexual identity 9
Table 12C: Q3I by sexual identity 10
Table 13A: Q3G by management status 10
Table 13B: Q3H by management status 11
Table 13C: Q3I by management status 11

BREAKDOWNS AND SELECTED ANALYSES OF RESPONSES TO Q3 & Q4:

Q3. "How often, if at all, have you <u>personally experienced</u> each of the following forms of discrimation based on a group characteristic (i.e., race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, disability, religion)?"

Q4: "How often, if at all, have you <u>directly observed</u> each of the following forms of discrimination <u>toward a co-worker</u> based on a group characteristic (i.e., race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, disability, religion)?"

I. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS, Q3 & Q4:

TABLE 1: Q3A & Q4A "NEGATIVE REMARKS BY CO-WORKERS"

Neg Rems by Co-Workers?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	186	47.33	47.33
Rarely	95	24.17	71.50
Sometime	96	24.43	95.93
Often	16	4.07	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

Observe Neg Rems by Co-Worker?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	115	29.49	29.49
Rarely	122	31.28	60.77
Sometime	125	32.05	92.82
Often	28	7.18	100.00
Total	390	100.00	

ABLE 2: Q3B & Q4B "NEGATIVE REMARKS BY FACULTY"

Neg Rems by Faculty?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	225	57.69	57.69
Rarely	85	21.79	79.49
Sometime	64	16.41	95.90
Often	16	4.10	100.00
Total	390	100.00	

Observe Neg Rems by Faculty?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	180	46.88	46.88
Rarely	96	25.00	71.88
Sometime	92	23.96	95.83
Often	16	4.17	100.00
Total	384	100.00	

ABLE 3: Q3C & Q4C "NEGATIVE REMARKS BY MANAGERS"

Neg Rems by Managers?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	208	53.06	53.06
Rarely	89	22.70	75.77
Sometime	76	19.39	95.15
Often	19	4.85	100.00
Total	392	100.00	

Observe Neg Rems by Managers?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	154	39.59	39.59
Rarely	108	27.76	67.35
Sometime	105	26.99	94.34
Often	22	5.66	100.00
Total	389	100.00	

TABLE 4: Q3D & Q4D "SOCIAL BEHAVIOR BY CO-WORKERS THAT TENDS TO EXCLUDE"

Co-Workers Socially Exclude?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	177	45.04	45.04
Rarely	89	22.65	67.68
Sometime	97	24.68	92.37
Often	30	7.63	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

Observe Co-Workers Exclude?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	136	34.96	34.96
Rarely	97	24.94	59.90
Sometime	125	32.13	92.03
Often	31	7.97	100.00
Total	389	100.00	

TABLE 5: Q3E & Q4E "BEHAVIOR BY STUDENTS THAT EXPRESSES NEGATIVE ATTITUDES"

Neg Attitudes by Students?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	152	38.68	38.68
Rarely	102	25.95	64.63
Sometime	111	28.24	92.88
Often	28	7.12	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

Observe Neg Att's by Students?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	125	32.13	32.13
Rarely	91	23.39	55.53
Sometime	134	34.45	89.97
Often	39	10.03	100.00
Total	389	100.00	

ABLE 6: Q3F & Q4F "BEHAVIOR BY STAFF OR CO-WORKERS THAT EXPRESSES NEGATIVE ATTITUDES"

eg Att's by taff/Co-Wor kers?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	150	38.36	38.36
Rarely	107	27.37	65.73
Sometime	107	27.37	93.09
Often	27	6.91	100.00
Total	391	100.00	

Observe Neg Att's by Staff/CoW?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	116	29.90	29.90
Rarely	117	30.15	60.05
Sometime	123	31.70	91.75
Often	32	8.25	100.00
Total	388	100.00	

TABLE 7: Q3G & Q4G "DEPARTMENTAL PATTERNS OF INTERACTION AND INFLUENCE, INCLUDING WORK ASSIGNMENTS, THAT TEND TO EXCLUDE OR DISADVANTAGE"

Departmnt Patterns isadvantage	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	197	50.26	50.26
Rarely	73	18.62	68.88
Sometime	80	20.41	89.29
Often	42	10.71	100.00
Total	392	100.00	

bserve Dept Patterns Disadvant	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	161	41.18	41.18
Rarely	90	23.02	64.19
Sometime	95	24.30	88.49
Often	45	11.51	100.00
Total	391	100.00	

ABLE 8: Q3H & Q4H "LESS DESIRABLE WORK ASSIGNMENTS"

Less Desirable Work Assignmnts?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	198	50.51	50.51
Rarely	90	22.96	73.47
Sometime	71	18.11	91.58
Often	33	8.42	100.00
Total	392	100.00	

bserve Less Desireable Work As	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	165	42.42	42.42
Rarely	88	22.62	65.04
Sometime	93	23.91	88.95
Often	43	11.05	100.00
Total	389	100.00	

ABLE 9: Q3I & Q4I "INEQUITABLE APPROACHES TO HIRING, RETENTION, OR ADVANCEMENT"

Inequitable HRTP pproaches?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	180	46.27	46.27
Rarely	67	17.22	63.50
Sometime	86	22.11	85.60
Often	56	14.40	100.00
Total	389	100.00	

Observe nequitable HRTP Approa	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	143	36.76	36.76
Rarely	81	20.82	57.58
Sometime	105	26.99	84.58
Often	60	15.42	100.00
Total	389	100.00	

II. ANALYSES OF Q3G, Q3H, Q3I BY RACE, GENDER, SEXUAL IDENTITY, AND MANAGEMENT STATUS

ABLE 10A: Q3G BY RACE/ETHNICITY

Departmnt Patterns isadvantage	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Never	24 36.36	17 50.00	16 33.33	116 58.59	16 51.61	189 50.13
Rarely	20 30.30	6 17.65	14 29.17	27 13.64	4 12.90	71 18.83
Sometime	17 25.76	3 8.82	10 20.83	40 20.20	7 22.58	77 20.42
Often	5 7.58	8 23.53	8 16.67	15 7.58	4 12.90	40 10.61
Total	66 100.00	34 100.00	48 100.00	198 100.00	31 100.00	377 100.00

chi2(12) = 31.5009 Prob>chi2 = 0.002

TABLE 10B: Q3H BY RACE/ETHNICITY

Less Desirable Work ssignmnts?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Never	24 36.92	17 50.00	18 37.50	116 58.59	16 50.00	191 50.66
Rarely	23 35.38	9 26.47	14 29.17	37 18.69	4 12.50	87 23.08
Sometime	12 18.46	2 5.88	10 20.83	34 17.17	9 28.13	67 17.77
Often	6 9.23	6 17.65	6 12.50	11 5.56	3 9.38	32 8.49
Total	65 100.00	34 100.00	48 100.00	198 100.00	32 100.00	377 100.00

chi2(12) = 26.2286 Prob>chi2 = 0.010

ABLE 10C: Q3I BY RACE/ETHNICITY

Inequitable HRTP pproaches?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Never	20	16	20	97	19	172
	31.25	47.06	41.67	49.49	59.38	45.99
Rarely	15	5	7	34	2	63
	23.44	14.71	14.58	17.35	6.25	16.84
Sometime	19	5	9	46	4	83
	29.69	14.71	18.75	23.47	12.50	22.19
Often	10	8	12	19	7	56
	15.63	23.53	25.00	9.69	21.88	14.97
Total	64	34	48	196	32	374
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 22.8503 Prob>chi2 = 0.029

ABLE 11A: Q3G BY GENDER

Departmnt Patterns isadvantag e	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
Never	84	108	192
	55.63	45.96	49.74
Rarely	25	48	73
	16.56	20.43	18.91
Sometime	23	57	80
	15.23	24.26	20.73
Often	19	22	41
	12.58	9.36	10.62
Total	151	235	386
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 6.9662 Prob>chi2 = 0.073

TABLE 11B: Q3H BY GENDER

Less Desirable Work Assignmnts?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
Never	81	113	194
	53.64	48.09	50.26
Rarely	42	48	90
	27.81	20.43	23.32
Sometime	15	54	69
	9.93	22.98	17.88
Often	13	20	33
	8.61	8.51	8.55
Total	151	235	386
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 11.4701 Prob>chi2 = 0.009

TABLE Q11C: Q3I BY GENDER

nequitable HRTP approaches?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
Never	70	106	176
	46.67	45.49	45.95
Rarely	32	35	67
	21.33	15.02	17.49
Sometime	30	55	85
	20.00	23.61	22.19
Often	18	37	55
	12.00	15.88	14.36
Total	150	233	383
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 3.5965 Prob>chi2 = 0.308

ABLE 12A: Q3G BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

Departmnt Patterns isadvantage	gaybi		
	Gay/Bi	Straight	Total
Never	35	148	183
	58.33	48.68	50.27
Rarely	6	61	67
	10.00	20.07	18.41
Sometime	13	63	76
	21.67	20.72	20.88
Often	6	32	38
	10.00	10.53	10.44
Total	60	304	364
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 3.7210 Prob>chi2 = 0.293

TABLE 12B: Q3H BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

Less Desirable Work ssignmnts?	gaybi		
	Gay/Bi	Straight	Total
Never	35	149	184
	58.33	49.01	50.55
Rarely	15	70	85
	25.00	23.03	23.35
Sometime	7	59	66
	11.67	19.41	18.13
Often	3	26	29
	5.00	8.55	7.97
Total	60	304	364
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 3.3947 Prob>chi2 = 0.335

TABLE 12C: Q3I BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

nequitable HRTP approaches?	gaybi		
	Gay/Bi	Straight	Total
Never	29	137	166
	49.15	45.36	45.98
Rarely	10	52	62
	16.95	17.22	17.17
Sometime	12	69	81
	20.34	22.85	22.44
Often	8	44	52
	13.56	14.57	14.40
Total	59	302	361
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 0.3295 Prob>chi2 = 0.954

TABLE 13A: Q3G BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Departmnt Patterns isadvantage	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Never	28	160	188
	59.57	48.63	50.00
Rarely	7	62	69
	14.89	18.84	18.35
Sometime	7	71	78
	14.89	21.58	20.74
Often	5	36	41
	10.64	10.94	10.90
Total	47	329	376
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 2.2246 Prob>chi2 = 0.527

ABLE 13B: Q3H BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Less Desirable Work Assignmnts?	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Never	27	162	189
	57.45	49.24	50.27
Rarely	10	76	86
	21.28	23.10	22.87
Sometime	6	62	68
	12.77	18.84	18.09
Often	4	29	33
	8.51	8.81	8.78
Total	47	329	376
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 1.4555 Prob>chi2 = 0.693

ABLE 13C: Q3I BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Inequitable HRTP pproaches?	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Never	19	153	172
	40.43	46.93	46.11
Rarely	11	52	63
	23.40	15.95	16.89
Sometime	10	73	83
	21.28	22.39	22.25
Often	7	48	55
	14.89	14.72	14.75
Total	47	326	373
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 1.7520 Prob>chi2 = 0.625

PART 4

REPORTED SEXUAL HARASSMENT (Q5 & Q6)

Table 1: Q5 Has respondent ever been sexually harassed on this campus? 1

Table 2: Q6 Does respondent know staff/administrator who has been sexually harassed? 1

Table 3: Personal experience of sexual harassment (q5) by gender 1

Table 4: Personal experience of sexual harassment by gender (non-management staff only) 2

Table 5: Personal experience of sexual harassment by sexual identity 2

BREAKDOWNS AND ANALYSES OF RESPONSES TO Q5 & Q6: SEXUAL HARASSMENT

TABLE 1: Q5 HAS RESPONDENT EVER BEEN SEXUALLY HARASSED ON THIS CAMPUS?

Experience Sexual Harassment?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
yes	51	12.98	12.98
no	342	87.02	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

TABLE 2: Q6 DOES RESPONDENT KNOW STAFF/ADMINISTRATOR WHO HAS BEEN SEXUALLY HARASSED?

Know Staff/Admn Sexually Harass	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
yes	112	28.57	28.57
no	280	71.43	100.00
Total	392	100.00	

TABLE 3: PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT (Q5) BY GENDER

Experience Sexual Harassment?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
yes	12	38	50
	7.89	16.17	12.92
no	140	197	337
	92.11	83.83	87.08
Total	152	235	387
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 5.6183 Prob>chi2 = 0.018

ABLE 4: PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY GENDER (NON-MANAGEMENT STAFF ONLY)

Experience Sexual Harassment?	sex Male	Female	Total
yes	10	33	43
	8.26	16.18	13.23
no	111	171	282
	91.74	83.82	86.77
Total	121	204	325
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 4.1415 Prob>chi2 = 0.042

ABLE 5: PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

Experience Sexual arassment?	gaybi Gay/Bi	Straight	Total
yes	13	36	49
	21.31	11.88	13.46
no	48	267	315
	78.69	88.12	86.54
Total	61	303	364
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 3.8763 Prob>chi2 = 0.049

PART 5

STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF MANAGERIAL RESPONSIVENESS TO HUMAN RELATIONS ISSUES (Q9, Q10, Q13A, Q13H, Q11)

Table 1A: Q9 frequency distribution	1
Table 1B: Q9 by race	1
Table 1C: Q9 by gender	2
Table 1D: Q9 by management status	3
Table 2A: Q10 frequencies	3
Table 2B: Q10 by race	4
Table 2C: Q10 by gender	4
Table 2D: Q10 by management status	5
Table 3A: Q13A frequencies	5
Table 3B: Q13A by race	6
Table 3C: Q13A by gender	6
Table 3D: Q13A by management status	7
Table 4A: Q13H frequencies	7
Table 4B: Q13H by race	8
Table 4C: Q13H by gender	9
Table 4D: Q13H by sexual identity	10
Table 4E: Q13H by disability	11
Table 4F: Q13H by religious faith	12
Table 4G: Q13H by management status	13
Table 5A: Q11 frequencies	13
Table 5B: Q11 by race	14
Table 5C: Q11 by gender	14
Table 5D: Q11 by management status	15

TTITUDES OF STAFF REGARDING RESPONSIVENESS OF SFSU MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS TO HUMAN RELATIONS ISSUES ON CAMPUS (Q9, Q10, Q13A, Q13H, Q11) -- BROKEN DOWN BY RACE, GENDER, MANAGEMENT STATUS

I. Q9: "Managers should take a more active role than they do now in furthering the recruitment, hiring, and retention of minority staff and management." [Agree/Disagree]

TABLE 1A: Q9 FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

grs do more Rct, Hire, minorit	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	150	40.00	40.00
ModAgree	82	21.87	61.87
Neither	64	17.07	78.93
ModDisag	44	11.73	90.67
StrDisag	35	9.33	100.00
Total	375	100.00	

ABLE 1B: Q9 BY RACE

Mgrs do more Rct, Hire, minorit	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	40	16	33	44	13	146
	62.50	48.48	70.21	23.40	44.83	40.44
ModAgree	16	7	8	37	10	78
	25.00	21.21	17.02	19.68	34.48	21.61
Neither	6	5	5	40	4	60
	9.38	15.15	10.64	21.28	13.79	16.62
ModDisag	0	4	0	39	0	43
	0.00	12.12	0.00	20.74	0.00	11.91
StrDisag	2	1	1	28	2	34
	3.13	3.03	2.13	14.89	6.90	9.42
Total	64	33	47	188	29	361
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(16) = 83.1219 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

ABLE 1C: Q9 BY GENDER

Mgrs do more Rct, Hire, minorit	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
StrAgree	54	94	148
	37.24	41.78	40.00
ModAgree	35	46	81
	24.14	20.44	21.89
Neither	21	42	63
	14.48	18.67	17.03
ModDisag	18	25	43
	12.41	11.11	11.62
StrDisag	17	18	35
	11.72	8.00	9.46
Total	145	225	370
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 3.3312 Prob>chi2 = 0.504

ABLE 1D: Q9 BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Mgrs do more Rct, Hire, minorit	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
StrAgree	23 47.92	123 39.30	146 40.44
ModAgree	17 35.42	62 19.81	79 21.88
Neither	4 8.33	55 17.57	59 16.34
ModDisag	2 4.17	41 13.10	43 11.91
StrDisag	2 4.17	32 10.22	34 9.42
Total	48 100.00	313 100.00	361 100.00

chi2(4) = 11.9799 Prob>chi2 = 0.018

II. Q10: "Managers should take a more active role than they do now in reducing intolerance and discrimination among staff." [Agree/Disagree]

TABLE 2A: Q10 FREQUENCIES

grs do more reduce discrim/int	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	218	57.67	57.67
ModAgree	80	21.16	78.84
Neither	58	15.34	94.18
ModDisag	14	3.70	97.88
StrDisag	8	2.12	100.00
Total	378	100.00	

TABLE 2B: Q10 BY RACE

Mgrs do ore reduce iscrim/int	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	44 69.84	25 75.76	40 86.96	81 42.19	21 70.00	211 57.97
ModAgree	14 22.22	5 15.15	3 6.52	51 26.56	4 13.33	77 21.15
Neither	3 4.76	3 9.09	3 6.52	41 21.35	5 16.67	55 15.11
ModDisag	2 3.17	0 0.00	0 0.00	12 6.25	0 0.00	14 3.85
StrDisag	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	7 3.65	0 0.00	7 1.92
Total	63 100.00	33 100.00	46 100.00	192 100.00	30 100.00	364 100.00

chi2(16) = 53.6996 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

TABLE 2C: Q10 BY GENDER

Mgrs do ore reduce iscrim/int	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
StrAgree	80 54.79	134 59.03	214 57.37
ModAgree	35 23.97	44 19.38	79 21.18
Neither	21 14.38	37 16.30	58 15.55
ModDisag	7 4.79	7 3.08	14 3.75
StrDisag	3 2.05	5 2.20	8 2.14
Total	146 100.00	227 100.00	373 100.00

chi2(4) = 2.0732 Prob>chi2 = 0.722

ABLE 2D: Q10 BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Mgrs do ore reduce iscrim/int	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
StrAgree	31	180	211
	64.58	56.96	57.97
ModAgree	9	65	74
	18.75	20.57	20.33
Neither	4	53	57
	8.33	16.77	15.66
ModDisag	4	10	14
	8.33	3.16	3.85
StrDisag	0	8	8
	0.00	2.53	2.20
Total	48	316	364
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 6.4902 Prob>chi2 = 0.165

III. Q13A: "The top administration (President, Vice Presidents, Deans) is genuinely committed to promoting multiracial understanding and cooperation at SFSU." [Agree/Disagree]

TABLE 3A: Q13A FREQUENCIES

Top Adm Genuinely Committed	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	78	19.85	19.85
ModAgree	123	31.30	51.15
Neither	75	19.08	70.23
ModDisag	67	17.05	87.28
StrDisag	50	12.72	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

ABLE 3B: Q13A BY RACE

Top Adm Genuinely Committed	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	11	6	3	46	6	72
	16.67	19.35	6.25	23.00	18.75	19.10
ModAgree	22	5	8	75	10	120
	33.33	16.13	16.67	37.50	31.25	31.83
Neither	15	8	12	29	8	72
	22.73	25.81	25.00	14.50	25.00	19.10
ModDisag	13	8	14	26	4	65
	19.70	25.81	29.17	13.00	12.50	17.24
StrDisag	5	4	11	24	4	48
	7.58	12.90	22.92	12.00	12.50	12.73
Total	66	31	48	200	32	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(16) = 32.1359 Prob>chi2 = 0.010

ABLE 3C: Q13A BY GENDER

Top Adm Genuinely Committed	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
StrAgree	27	49	76
	17.88	20.68	19.59
ModAgree	49	74	123
	32.45	31.22	31.70
Neither	29	46	75
	19.21	19.41	19.33
ModDisag	23	41	64
	15.23	17.30	16.49
StrDisag	23	27	50
	15.23	11.39	12.89
Total	151	237	388
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 1.7076 Prob>chi2 = 0.789

ABLE 3D: Q13A BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Top Adm Genuinely Committed	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
StrAgree	15	58	73
	31.25	17.63	19.36
ModAgree	17	101	118
	35.42	30.70	31.30
Neither	4	68	72
	8.33	20.67	19.10
ModDisag	6	60	66
	12.50	18.24	17.51
StrDisag	6	42	48
	12.50	12.77	12.73
Total	48	329	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 8.4386 Prob>chi2 = 0.077

IV. Q13H: "Managers on campus are generally sensitive to the needs of multicultural groups on campus." [Agree/Disagree]

ABLE 4A: Q13H FREQUENCIES

Mgrs ensitive to Multicult Grp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	42	10.66	10.66
ModAgree	114	28.93	39.59
Neither	105	26.65	66.24
ModDisag	86	21.83	88.07
StrDisag	47	11.93	100.00
Total	394	100.00	

ABLE 4B: Q13H BY RACE

Mgrs Sensitive to Multicult Grp	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	4	2	0	28	3	37
	6.06	6.06	0.00	14.00	9.38	9.79
ModAgree	13	10	5	71	9	108
	19.70	30.30	10.64	35.50	28.13	28.57
Neither	26	8	11	55	3	103
	39.39	24.24	23.40	27.50	9.38	27.25
ModDisag	14	7	17	34	12	84
	21.21	21.21	36.17	17.00	37.50	22.22
StrDisag	9	6	14	12	5	46
	13.64	18.18	29.79	6.00	15.63	12.17
Total	66	33	47	200	32	378
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(16) = 57.4659 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

ABLE 4C: Q13H BY GENDER

Mgrs Sensitive to Multicult Grp	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
StrAgree	22	18	40
	14.38	7.63	10.28
ModAgree	47	66	113
	30.72	27.97	29.05
Neither	37	68	105
	24.18	28.81	26.99
ModDisag	25	59	84
	16.34	25.00	21.59
StrDisag	22	25	47
	14.38	10.59	12.08
Total	153	236	389
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 9.4198 Prob>chi2 = 0.051

ABLE 4D: Q13H BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

Mgrs Sensitive to Multicult Grp	gaybi		
	Gay/Bi	Straight	Total
StrAgree	6	32	38
	9.68	10.56	10.41
ModAgree	17	85	102
	27.42	28.05	27.95
Neither	15	85	100
	24.19	28.05	27.40
ModDisag	11	70	81
	17.74	23.10	22.19
StrDisag	13	31	44
	20.97	10.23	12.05
Total	62	303	365
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 5.9140 Prob>chi2 = 0.206

BLE 4E: Q13H BY DISABILITY

Mgrs Sensitive to Multicult Grp	disabled		
	yes	no	Total
StrAgree	3	34	37
	14.29	9.63	9.89
ModAgree	4	101	105
	19.05	28.61	28.07
Neither	4	98	102
	19.05	27.76	27.27
ModDisag	7	76	83
	33.33	21.53	22.19
StrDisag	3	44	47
	14.29	12.46	12.57
Total	21	353	374
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 2.9283 Prob>chi2 = 0.570

ABLE 4F: Q13H BY RELIGIOUS FAITH

Mgrs Sensitive to Multicult Grp	relig Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
StrAgree	18 9.73	3 15.79	0 0.00	13 10.74	3 7.14	37 10.03
ModAgree	60 32.43	6 31.58	1 50.00	28 23.14	13 30.95	108 29.27
Neither	52 28.11	5 26.32	1 50.00	38 31.40	6 14.29	102 27.64
ModDisag	33 17.84	3 15.79	0 0.00	31 25.62	12 28.57	79 21.41
StrDisag	22 11.89	2 10.53	0 0.00	11 9.09	8 19.05	43 11.65
Total	185 100.00	19 100.00	2 100.00	121 100.00	42 100.00	369 100.00

chi2(16) = 14.2635 Prob>chi2 = 0.579

ABLE 4G: Q13H BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Mgrs Sensitive to Multicult Grp	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
StrAgree	7	31	38
	14.58	9.42	10.08
ModAgree	16	91	107
	33.33	27.66	28.38
Neither	8	95	103
	16.67	28.88	27.32
ModDisag	9	73	82
	18.75	22.19	21.75
StrDisag	8	39	47
	16.67	11.85	12.47
Total	48	329	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 4.8732 Prob>chi2 = 0.301

V. Q11: "Over the past five years, do you think SFSU's affirmative action programs have ... improved, stayed the same, gotten worse, or no basis for judgment?"

ABLE 5A: Q11 FREQUENCIES

SFSU Affirm Act Prog Improved?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Improved	110	27.85	27.85
Same	95	24.05	51.90
Worsened	49	12.41	64.30
NoBasis	141	35.70	100.00
Total	395	100.00	

ABLE 5B: Q11 BY RACE

SFSU Affirm Act Prog Improved?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Improved	20	9	7	64	8	108
	30.30	26.47	14.58	32.00	25.00	28.42
Same	21	6	17	42	4	90
	31.82	17.65	35.42	21.00	12.50	23.68
Worsened	5	6	10	19	7	47
	7.58	17.65	20.83	9.50	21.88	12.37
NoBasis	20	13	14	75	13	135
	30.30	38.24	29.17	37.50	40.63	35.53
Total	66	34	48	200	32	380
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 21.8681 Prob>chi2 = 0.039

ABLE 5C: Q11 BY GENDER

SFSU Affirm Act Prog Improved?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
Improved	32	77	109
	21.05	32.35	27.95
Same	39	53	92
	25.66	22.27	23.59
Worsened	24	25	49
	15.79	10.50	12.56
NoBasis	57	83	140
	37.50	34.87	35.90
Total	152	238	390
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 6.9303 Prob>chi2 = 0.074

BLE 5D: Q11 BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

SFSU Affirm Act Prog Improved?	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Improved	26	79	105
	54.17	23.87	27.70
Same	13	77	90
	27.08	23.26	23.75
Worsened	4	45	49
	8.33	13.60	12.93
NoBasis	5	130	135
	10.42	39.27	35.62
Total	48	331	379
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 24.8482 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

PART 6

STAFF KNOWLEDGE OF AND SATISFACTION WITH GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES (Q14, Q15)

Table 1A: Q14 frequencies	1
Table 1B: Q14 by race	1
Table 1C: Q14 by gender	1
Table 1D: Q14 by sexual identity	2
Table 1E: Q14 by disability	2
Table 1F: Q14 by religious faith	2
Table 1G: Q14 by management status	3
Table 2A: Q15 frequencies	3
Table 2B: Q15 by race	4
Table 2C: Q15 by gender	4
Table 2D: Q15 by sexual identity	5
Table 2E: Q15 by religious faith	5
Table 2F: Q15 by disability	6
Table 2G: Q15 by management status	6

TAFF KNOWLEDGE OF AND SATISFACTION WITH SFSU GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES
Q14, Q15)

I. Q14: "If you had convincing evidence of an instance of discrimination against yourself or a co-worker, do you know what steps you would take to deal with it?"

ABLE 1A: Q14 FREQUENCIES

If Discrim, Know What Steps?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
yes	192	50.39	50.39
no	189	49.61	100.00
Total	381	100.00	

ABLE 1B: Q14 BY RACE

f Discrim, Know What Steps?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
yes	26	14	22	108	15	185
	41.27	43.75	51.16	55.10	46.88	50.55
no	37	18	21	88	17	181
	58.73	56.25	48.84	44.90	53.13	49.45
Total	63	32	43	196	32	366
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 4.5665 Prob>chi2 = 0.335

TABLE 1C: Q14 BY GENDER

f Discrim, Know What Steps?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
yes	82	109	191
	55.41	47.60	50.66
no	66	120	186
	44.59	52.40	49.34
Total	148	229	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 2.1922 Prob>chi2 = 0.139

TABLE 1D: Q14 BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

If Discrim, Know What Steps?	gaybi: Gay/Bi	Straight	Total
yes	29	152	181
	49.15	51.53	51.13
no	30	143	173
	50.85	48.47	48.87
Total	59	295	354
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 0.1108 Prob>chi2 = 0.739

TABLE 1E: Q14 BY DISABILITY

If Discrim, Know What Steps?	disabled: yes	no	Total
yes	12	171	183
	60.00	50.00	50.55
no	8	171	179
	40.00	50.00	49.45
Total	20	342	362
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 0.7559 Prob>chi2 = 0.385

TABLE 1F: Q14 BY RELIGIOUS FAITH

If Discrim, Know What Steps?	relig: Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
yes	93	11	2	56	21	183
	52.84	57.89	100.00	47.06	51.22	51.26
no	83	8	0	63	20	174
	47.16	42.11	0.00	52.94	48.78	48.74
Total	176	19	2	119	41	357
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 3.2532 Prob>chi2 = 0.516

ABLE 1G: Q14 BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

If Discrim, Know What Steps?	manage: Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
yes	34	152	186
	73.91	47.20	50.54
no	12	170	182
	26.09	52.80	49.46
Total	46	322	368
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 11.4858 Prob>chi2 = 0.001

II. Q15: "Do you feel adequate procedures are in place at SFSU to deal with complaints about prejudice or discrimination against staff/administrators?"

ABLE 2A: Q15 FREQUENCIES

Adequate Procedures in Place?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Yes	89	23.24	23.24
No	61	15.93	39.16
DontKnow	233	60.84	100.00
Total	383	100.00	

ABLE 2B: Q15 BY RACE

Adequate Procedures in Place?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Yes	6	13	5	52	9	85
	9.38	38.24	10.87	26.94	29.03	23.10
No	13	8	9	23	6	59
	20.31	23.53	19.57	11.92	19.35	16.03
DontKnow	45	13	32	118	16	224
	70.31	38.24	69.57	61.14	51.61	60.87
Total	64	34	46	193	31	368
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 22.6197 Prob>chi2 = 0.004

ABLE 2C: Q15 BY GENDER

Adequate Procedures in Place?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
Yes	40	49	89
	26.85	21.21	23.42
No	20	41	61
	13.42	17.75	16.05
DontKnow	89	141	230
	59.73	61.04	60.53
Total	149	231	380
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 2.3089 Prob>chi2 = 0.315

ABLE 2D: Q15 BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

Adequate Procedures in Place?	gaybi		
	Gay/Bi	Straight	Total
Yes	18	65	83
	29.03	22.18	23.38
No	12	43	55
	19.35	14.68	15.49
DontKnow	32	185	217
	51.61	63.14	61.13
Total	62	293	355
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 2.8618 Prob>chi2 = 0.239

ABLE 2E: Q15 BY RELIGIOUS FAITH

Adequate Procedures in Place?	relig					
	Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
Yes	46	7	0	26	3	82
	25.84	36.84	0.00	21.85	7.69	22.97
No	24	3	0	22	11	60
	13.48	15.79	0.00	18.49	28.21	16.81
DontKnow	108	9	2	71	25	215
	60.67	47.37	100.00	59.66	64.10	60.22
Total	178	19	2	119	39	357
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 12.6080 Prob>chi2 = 0.126

ABLE 2F: Q15 BY DISABILITY

Adequate Procedures in Place?	disabled yes	no	Total
Yes	6	79	85
	30.00	22.97	23.35
No	6	54	60
	30.00	15.70	16.48
DontKnow	8	211	219
	40.00	61.34	60.16
Total	20	344	364
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 4.1764 Prob>chi2 = 0.124

ABLE 2G: Q15 BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Adequate Procedures in Place?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Yes	21	63	84
	45.65	19.57	22.83
No	6	54	60
	13.04	16.77	16.30
DontKnow	19	205	224
	41.30	63.66	60.87
Total	46	322	368
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 15.6490 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

PART 7

STAFF AWARENESS OF HRC (Q27, Q27A, Q27B)

Table 1: Q27, Q27A, Q27B frequencies 1
Table 2: Q27, Q27A, Q27B by race 2
Table 3: Q27, Q27A, Q27B by gender 3
Table 4: Q27, Q27A, Q27B by management status 4

TAFF AWARENESS OF HRC (Q27, Q27A, Q27B)

ABLE 1: Q27, Q27A, Q27B FREQUENCIES

Aware HRC Held Hearings?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
yes	204	52.58	52.58
no	184	47.42	100.00
Total	388	100.00	

(IF YES TO Q27...)

Submit Evidence to HRC?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
yes	15	7.58	7.58
no	183	92.42	100.00
Total	198	100.00	

(IF YES TO Q27...)

Consider Submtg Evid but Didnt?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
yes	30	17.65	17.65
no	140	82.35	100.00
Total	170	100.00	

BLE 2: Q27, Q27A, Q27B BY RACE

Aware HRC Held Hearings?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
yes	22	18	26	110	20	196
	34.92	52.94	55.32	55.56	62.50	52.41
no	41	16	21	88	12	178
	65.08	47.06	44.68	44.44	37.50	47.59
Total	63	34	47	198	32	374
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 9.9810 Prob>chi2 = 0.041

(IF YES TO Q27...)

Submit vidence to HRC?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
yes	2	2	3	6	1	14
no	19	16	23	99	19	176
Total	21	18	26	105	20	190

IF YES TO Q27...)

Consider ubmtg Evid ut Didnt?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
yes	2	2	4	18	4	30
	10.53	12.50	21.05	19.15	23.53	18.18
no	17	14	15	76	13	135
	89.47	87.50	78.95	80.85	76.47	81.82
Total	19	16	19	94	17	165
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 1.5869 Prob>chi2 = 0.811

ABLE 3: Q27, Q27A, Q27B BY GENDER

Aware HRC Held Hearings?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
yes	80	119	199
	53.69	51.07	52.09
no	69	114	183
	46.31	48.93	47.91
Total	149	233	382
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 0.2497 Prob>chi2 = 0.617

(IF YES TO Q27...)

Submit vidence to HRC?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
yes	4	11	15
	5.00	9.65	7.73
no	76	103	179
	95.00	90.35	92.27
Total	80	114	194
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 1.4243 Prob>chi2 = 0.233

(IF YES TO Q27...)

Consider Submtg Evid but Didnt?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
yes	12	18	30
	17.65	18.37	18.07
no	56	80	136
	82.35	81.63	81.93
Total	68	98	166
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 0.0141 Prob>chi2 = 0.906

TABLE 4: Q27, Q27A, Q27B BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Aware HRC Held Hearings?	manage: Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
yes	38	160	198
	79.17	49.54	53.37
no	10	163	173
	20.83	50.46	46.63
Total	48	323	371
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 14.7435 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

(IF YES TO Q27...)

Submit vidence to HRC?	manage: Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
yes	2	13	15
	5.56	8.33	7.81
no	34	143	177
	94.44	91.67	92.19
Total	36	156	192
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 0.3134 Prob>chi2 = 0.576

(IF YES TO Q27...)

Consider Submtg Evid but Didnt?	manage: Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
yes	5	25	30
	14.29	19.23	18.18
no	30	105	135
	85.71	80.77	81.82
Total	35	130	165
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 0.4533 Prob>chi2 = 0.501

PART 8

STAFF OPINIONS ON HUMAN RELATIONS ISSUES (Q13A-Q13H)

Table 1: Q13A-Q13H frequencies 1
Table 2: Q13A-Q13H by race 4

STAFF OPINIONS ON HUMAN RELATIONS ISSUES (Q13A-Q13H): TOTAL SAMPLE FREQUENCIES AND BREAKDOWNS BY RACE ONLY (SEE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ORIGINAL TEXT)

TABLE 1: Q13A-Q13H FREQUENCIES

. tab q13a

Top Adm Genuinely Committed	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	78	19.85	19.85
ModAgree	123	31.30	51.15
Neither	75	19.08	70.23
ModDisag	67	17.05	87.28
StrDisag	50	12.72	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

. tab q13b

Discrim at SFSU by Small Min	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	95	24.11	24.11
ModAgree	118	29.95	54.06
Neither	59	14.97	69.04
ModDisag	79	20.05	89.09
StrDisag	43	10.91	100.00
Total	394	100.00	

. tab q13c

Too Much Emph on Group Diff's	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	146	37.15	37.15
ModAgree	101	25.70	62.85
Neither	77	19.59	82.44
ModDisag	49	12.47	94.91
StrDisag	20	5.09	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

. tab q13d

SFSU Hum Rel Relatively Good	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	66	16.79	16.79
ModAgree	148	37.66	54.45
Neither	90	22.90	77.35
ModDisag	63	16.03	93.38
StrDisag	26	6.62	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

. tab q13e

SFSU Shld bt Restrict Speech	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	81	20.93	20.93
ModAgree	64	16.54	37.47
Neither	48	12.40	49.87
ModDisag	73	18.86	68.73
StrDisag	121	31.27	100.00
Total	387	100.00	

. tab q13f

Affirm Action Lowers Quality	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	77	19.59	19.59
ModAgree	78	19.85	39.44
Neither	50	12.72	52.16
ModDisag	61	15.52	67.68
StrDisag	127	32.32	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

tab q13g

White Males Equally Mistreated	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	40	10.18	10.18
ModAgree	63	16.03	26.21
Neither	66	16.79	43.00
ModDisag	84	21.37	64.38
StrDisag	140	35.62	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

. tab q13h

Mgrs ensitive to Multicult Grp	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
StrAgree	42	10.66	10.66
ModAgree	114	28.93	39.59
Neither	105	26.65	66.24
ModDisag	86	21.83	88.07
StrDisag	47	11.93	100.00
Total	394	100.00	

ABLE 2: Q13A-Q13H BY RACE

. tab q13a race, col chi2

Top Adm Genuinely Committed	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	11	6	3	46	6	72
	16.67	19.35	6.25	23.00	18.75	19.10
ModAgree	22	5	8	75	10	120
	33.33	16.13	16.67	37.50	31.25	31.83
Neither	15	8	12	29	8	72
	22.73	25.81	25.00	14.50	25.00	19.10
ModDisag	13	8	14	26	4	65
	19.70	25.81	29.17	13.00	12.50	17.24
StrDisag	5	4	11	24	4	48
	7.58	12.90	22.92	12.00	12.50	12.73
Total	66	31	48	200	32	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(16) = 32.1359 Prob>chi2 = 0.010

tab q13b race, col chi2

Discrim at SFSU by Small Min	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	8	11	2	62	6	89
	12.12	34.38	4.17	31.00	18.75	23.54
ModAgree	19	8	11	66	12	116
	28.79	25.00	22.92	33.00	37.50	30.69
Neither	13	4	8	27	3	55
	19.70	12.50	16.67	13.50	9.38	14.55
ModDisag	17	5	15	34	7	78
	25.76	15.63	31.25	17.00	21.88	20.63
StrDisag	9	4	12	11	4	40
	13.64	12.50	25.00	5.50	12.50	10.58
Total	66	32	48	200	32	378
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(16) = 42.5846 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

. tab q13c race, col chi2

Too Much Emph on Group Diff's	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	21	13	18	72	10	134
	31.82	40.63	37.50	36.18	31.25	35.54
ModAgree	17	6	14	56	8	101
	25.76	18.75	29.17	28.14	25.00	26.79
Neither	17	7	6	36	9	75
	25.76	21.88	12.50	18.09	28.13	19.89
ModDisag	7	1	9	27	4	48
	10.61	3.13	18.75	13.57	12.50	12.73
StrDisag	4	5	1	8	1	19
	6.06	15.63	2.08	4.02	3.13	5.04
Total	66	32	48	199	32	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(16) = 18.4985 Prob>chi2 = 0.296

. tab q13d race, col chi2

SFSU Hum Rel Relatively Good	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	4	6	3	41	7	61
	6.06	18.18	6.38	20.60	21.88	16.18
ModAgree	26	8	12	90	8	144
	39.39	24.24	25.53	45.23	25.00	38.20
Neither	20	9	12	40	5	86
	30.30	27.27	25.53	20.10	15.63	22.81
ModDisag	12	6	13	21	10	62
	18.18	18.18	27.66	10.55	31.25	16.45
StrDisag	4	4	7	7	2	24
	6.06	12.12	14.89	3.52	6.25	6.37
Total	66	33	47	199	32	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(16) = 43.1126 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

```
tab q13e race, col chi2
```

SFSU Shld Not Restrict Speech	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	18	3	5	40	10	76
	27.27	9.38	10.64	20.62	31.25	20.49
ModAgree	12	10	5	31	4	62
	18.18	31.25	10.64	15.98	12.50	16.71
Neither	12	3	3	23	6	47
	18.18	9.38	6.38	11.86	18.75	12.67
ModDisag	6	7	9	46	5	73
	9.09	21.88	19.15	23.71	15.63	19.68
StrDisag	18	9	25	54	7	113
	27.27	28.13	53.19	27.84	21.88	30.46
Total	66	32	47	194	32	371
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(16) = 32.5597 Prob>chi2 = 0.008

```
. tab q13f race, col chi2
```

Affirm Action Lowers Quality	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	11	5	0	54	5	75
	16.67	15.15	0.00	27.14	15.63	19.89
ModAgree	13	7	1	49	5	75
	19.70	21.21	2.13	24.62	15.63	19.89
Neither	12	4	3	21	6	46
	18.18	12.12	6.38	10.55	18.75	12.20
ModDisag	9	3	6	33	8	59
	13.64	9.09	12.77	16.58	25.00	15.65
StrDisag	21	14	37	42	8	122
	31.82	42.42	78.72	21.11	25.00	32.36
Total	66	33	47	199	32	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(16) = 74.2418 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

tab q13g race, col chi2

White Males Equally Mistreated	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	2	2	0	28	3	35
	3.08	6.06	0.00	14.00	9.38	9.28
ModAgree	11	3	3	41	5	63
	16.92	9.09	6.38	20.50	15.63	16.71
Neither	16	4	6	28	8	62
	24.62	12.12	12.77	14.00	25.00	16.45
ModDisag	13	8	12	42	6	81
	20.00	24.24	25.53	21.00	18.75	21.49
StrDisag	23	16	26	61	10	136
	35.38	48.48	55.32	30.50	31.25	36.07
Total	65	33	47	200	32	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(16) = 32.5099 Prob>chi2 = 0.009

. tab q13h race, col chi2

Mgrs Sensitive to Multicult Grp	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
StrAgree	4	2	0	28	3	37
	6.06	6.06	0.00	14.00	9.38	9.79
ModAgree	13	10	5	71	9	108
	19.70	30.30	10.64	35.50	28.13	28.57
Neither	26	8	11	55	3	103
	39.39	24.24	23.40	27.50	9.38	27.25
ModDisag	14	7	17	34	12	84
	21.21	21.21	36.17	17.00	37.50	22.22
StrDisag	9	6	14	12	5	46
	13.64	18.18	29.79	6.00	15.63	12.17
Total	66	33	47	200	32	378
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(16) = 57.4659 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

7

Human Relations

Staff/Administrator Survey

Public Research Institute

San Francisco State University

NOTE: As you think about these questions, please remember that your answers will be **anonymous**. It is very important for SFSU's Human Relations Commission to learn what staff and administrators actually think and feel about these issues. Please base your answers on your experiences and observations since you began working at SFSU. Please do your best to give **frank** answers.

Q1. The basic mission of the Human Relations Commission is to find out whether people at San Francisco State University are treated differently based on their race, ethnicity, religion, national origins, gender, sexual identity, or disabilities. In general, would you say that members of the following groups are treated **better**, about **the same**, or worse than the average person at SFSU by other members of the campus community? Please check one box in each row.

	Better	About Same	Worse	Don't Know
Arabs	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Asians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Pacific Islanders	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Blacks/African Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Hispanics/Latinos/Chicanos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Native Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Filipinos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Whites	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Men	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Women	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Gays/Lesbians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Fundamentalist Christians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Jews	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Muslims	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Disabled	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Foreigners	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q2. As a staff/administrator at SFSU, how often, if at all, have you been offended, put down, or physically or emotionally abused in any way by other members of the campus community on the basis of your ... Check one box in each row.

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Gender?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Race/Ethnicity?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Sexual orientation?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Religious beliefs?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Disability?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
National origins?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q3. How often, if at all, have you personally experienced each of the following forms of discrimination based on a group characteristic (i.e., race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, disability, religion)? Check one box in each row.

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Negative remarks by co-workers	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Negative remarks by faculty	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Negative remarks by managers	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Social behavior by co-workers that tends to exclude	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Behavior by students that expresses negative attitudes	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Behavior by staff or co-workers that expresses negative attitudes	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Departmental patterns of interaction and influence, including work assignments, that tend to exclude or disadvantage	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Less desirable work assignments	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Inequitable approaches to hiring, retention, or advancement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q4. How often, if at all, have you directly observed each of the following forms of discrimination toward a co-worker based on a group characteristic (i.e., race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, disability, religion)? Check one box in each row.

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Negative remarks by co-workers	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Negative remarks by faculty	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Negative remarks by managers	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Social behavior by co-workers that tends to exclude	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Behavior by students that expresses negative attitudes	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Behavior by staff or co-workers that expresses negative attitudes	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Departmental patterns of interaction and influence, including work assignments, that tend to exclude or disadvantage	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Less desirable work assignments	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Inequitable approaches to hiring, retention, or advancement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q5. Sexual harassment is "a person's use of University authority, rank, or position to make sexual advances, request sexual favors, or engage in other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature." By this definition, have you yourself ever been sexually harassed on this campus?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

Q6. Do you know any staff/administrator who has been sexually harassed?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

Q7. In your opinion, are persons in each of the following groups advantaged or disadvantaged in <u>hiring decisions</u> by your department? <u>Check one box in each row.</u>

	Advantaged	No Difference	Disadvantaged	Don't Know
Arabs	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Asians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Pacific Islanders	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Blacks/African Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Hispanics/Latinos/ Chicanos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Native Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Filipinos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Whites	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Men	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Women	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Gays/Lesbians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Fundamentalist Christians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Jews	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Muslims	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Disabled	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Foreigners	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q8. In your opinion, are persons in each of the following groups advantaged or disadvantaged in <u>appointments to management positions</u> in the University? <u>Check one box in each row.</u>

	Advantaged	No Difference	Disadvantaged	Don't Know
Arabs	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Asians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Pacific Islanders	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Blacks/African Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Hispanics/Latinos/ Chicanos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Native Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Filipinos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Whites	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Men	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Women	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Gays/Lesbians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Fundamentalist Christians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Jews	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Muslims	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Disabled	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Foreigners	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q9. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement: "Managers should take a more active role than they they do now in furthering the recruitment, hiring, and retention of minority staff and management."

Strongly agree	[ ]
Moderately agree	[ ]
Neither agree nor disagree	[ ]
Moderately disagree	[ ]
Strongly disagree	[ ]
Don't know, no opinion	[ ]

Q10. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement: "Managers should take a more active role than they do now in reducing intolerance and discrimination among staff."

Strongly agree	[ ]
Moderately agree	[ ]
Neither agree nor disagree	[ ]
Moderately disagree	[ ]
Strongly disagree	[ ]
Don't know, no opinion	[ ]

Q11. Over the past five years, do you think SFSU's affirmative action programs have . . .

[ ] Improved

[ ] Stayed the Same

[ ] Gotten Worse

[ ] No Basis for Judgment

Q12. Please consider whether each factor listed below limits recruitment of new staff or managers in your department. If you think a listed factor does limit recruitment from one or more of the specified groups, check the box(es) for that factor in the appropriate column(s).

FACTOR	Does the listed factor limit recruitment from...? People of Color	Women	Disabled People
A. Scarcity of members of this group with skills in my classification.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
B. Members of this group lack specialties needed in my classification.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
C. Members of this group tend to be less qualified than white males in my classification.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
D. Insufficient interest in my department to hire members of this group.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
E. Finding qualified people in this group takes more time and effort than finding qualified white males.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
F. Overt prejudice and discrimination by people involved in recruiting or hiring.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
G. Implicit and/or institutional discrimination.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
H. OTHER_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
I. OTHER_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q12A. In your judgment, which of these factors, if any, most seriously limits recruitment of new staff/administrators from the groups named above (A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, or "none")?

Answer:_____

Q12B. In your judgment, which of these factors, if any, next most seriously limits recruitment of new staff/administrators from the groups named above (A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, or "none")?

Answer:_____

Q13. What follows are <u>statements of opinion</u> about life at San Francisco State University. Some staff/administrators agree with these opinions, others disagree. We want to know what you think.

A. "The top administration (President, Vice Presidents, Deans) is genuinely committed to promoting multiracial understanding and cooperation at SFSU."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

B. "Incidents of discrimination and prejudice at S. F. State are caused by a very small number of people and do not reflect the beliefs and attitudes of the majority."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

C. "People on this campus spend too much time emphasizing their differences with people of other groups (that is, of other races, religions, etc.) rather than exploring values and goals they have in common."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

D. "Compared to what I see and hear off-campus, human relations among different groups on-campus at S. F. State are relatively good."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

E. "The University should not restrict my right to say publicly anything I want about members of other groups, even if what I say might be regarded as offensive or insulting."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

F. "Too much emphasis on affirmative action in hiring and retention carries a risk of lowering the quality of staff/administrators at SFSU."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

G. "White male staff/administrators at SFSU face at least as much prejudice and intolerance as any other group."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

H. "Managers on campus are generally sensitive to the needs of multicultural groups on campus."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

Q14. If you had convincing evidence of an instance of discrimination against yourself or a co-worker, do you know what steps you would take to deal with it?

[ ] Yes ----------

[ ] No

Q14A. If "yes," what would those steps be? _____

_____

_____

Q15. Do you feel adequate procedures are in place at SFSU to deal with complaints about prejudice or discrimination against staff/ administrators?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

[ ] Don't know, not sure.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

So that we can see how your opinions compare with those of other staff and administrators at SFSU, we'd like a few facts about you. Again, please remember that all of your answers are <u>anonymous</u>.

Q16. Are you ... ? [ ] Male [ ] Female

Q17. What is your age? _____ years.

Q18. What is your collective bargaining unit?

[ ] Don't Know

[ ] Unit 1 - Physicians
[ ] Unit 2 - Health Care Support
[ ] Unit 4 - Academic Support
[ ] Unit 5 - Operations Support
[ ] Unit 6 - Skilled Crafts
[ ] Unit 7 - Clerical/Administrative Support
[ ] Unit 8 - Public Safety
[ ] Unit 9 - Technical Support Services
[ ] Management

Q19. Do you have permanent status? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Q20. How many years have you worked as a staff/administrator at SFSU?

_____ Years

Q21. Please indicate each diploma and degree that you hold, if any. Check all that apply.

[ ] High School Diploma
[ ] Baccalaureate
[ ] Master's
[ ] Doctorate
[ ] Other (Please specify_____ _____)

Q22. Do you have any disability?

[ ] Yes -----
[ ] No

Q22A. If yes, please describe:

_____
_____
_____

Q23. If you were to describe your own ethnic, racial, or cultural identification to a friend, what words would you use?

_____

Q24. For classification purposes, we'd like to know what race or ethnic group you identify with. (The following categories are taken from the University's federal Affirmative Action report.) (Check one box.)

[ ] Filipino
[ ] Asian
[ ] Pacific Islander
[ ] Mexican-American
[ ] Hispanic
[ ] American Indian
[ ] Black non-Hispanic
[ ] White non-Hispanic
[ ] Other (Describe: _____)

Q25. What is your religous preference, if any? Is it Christian, Jewish, Islamic, some other religion, or no religion? (Check one box.)

[ ] Christian
[ ] Jewish
[ ] Islamic
[ ] None
[ ] Other (Describe: _____)

Q25A. If you answered "Christian" to Q25, would you describe yourself as a Fundamentalist Christian? (Skip to Q26 if not applicable.)

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Q26. Are you... ? (Check one box.)

[ ] Heterosexual
[ ] Gay or lesbian
[ ] Bisexual

Your answers to these last questions will help the Human Relations Commission evaluate responsiveness to its requests for evidence and testimony about discriminatory or insensitive actions on this campus.

Q27. Were you aware that the Human Relations Commission held hearings on campus to receive evidence about instances of prejudice or discrimination?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No (PLEASE SKIP TO Q28.)

Q27A. (If Yes) Did you submit evidence to the Human Relations Commission?

[ ] Yes (PLEASE SKIP TO Q28.)

[ ] No

Q27B. (If No to Q27A) Did you consider submitting evidence to the Human Relations Commission or appearing at one of the Commission's hearings, but decide not to do so?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No (PLEASE SKIP TO Q28.)

Q27C. (If Yes to Q27B) Please explain why you decided not to submit evidence or appear at a hearing.

_____
_____
_____

Q28. Using the format below, please give examples of what you believe were discriminatory or insensitive actions, if any, which you have observed on this campus.

[ ] Check this box if you have observed no such actions on this campus.

[ ] Check this box if you have observed such actions on this campus but are unable or unwilling to provide specific examples.

FORMAT FOR EXAMPLES:

Incident #1:

TYPE: (related to race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, sexual identiy/orientation, disability)
_____

BRIEF DESCRIPTION: _____
_____
_____

ACTION YOU TOOK, IF ANY: _____
_____

RESPONSE YOU RECEIVED: _____
_____

SATISFACTION WITH RESOLUTION: _____
_____

IF DISSATISFIED, HOW WOULD YOU HAVE PREFERRED THE INCIDENT TO BE HANDLED AND RESOLVED? _____
_____

Incident #2:

TYPE: (related to race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, sexual identiy/orientation, disability)
_____

BRIEF DESCRIPTION: _____
_____
_____

ACTION YOU TOOK, IF ANY: _____
_____

RESPONSE YOU RECEIVED: _____
_____

SATISFACTION WITH RESOLUTION: _____
_____

IF DISSATISFIED, HOW WOULD YOU HAVE PREFERRED THE INCIDENT TO BE HANDLED AND RESOLVED? _____
_____

(Use space below or reverse for additional examples.)

Please use the space below to write any additional thoughts or comments you would like to share with the members of the Human Relations Commission.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!

Please use the envelope provided and return questionnaire through campus mail to:

Public Research Institute
c/o Department of Political Science
SCI 379

SELECTED FINDINGS

from the

SFSU HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

STAFF SURVEY

March-April, 1990

(CONTINUED)

PARTS 9-15

Principal Investigators:

Richard DeLeon
James Newton
Robert Smith

May 14, 1990

Public Research Institute
San Francisco State University

CONTENTS

PART 9: NOTES ON SAMPLE DESIGN AND SURVEY METHODS

PART 10: ADDITIONAL SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

PART 11: STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF HOW LISTED GROUPS ARE TREATED BY THE SFSU CAMPUS COMMUNITY (Q1)

PART 12: STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF ADVANTAGE OR DISADVANTAGE IN HIRING DECISIONS INVOLVING PERSONS IN LISTED GROUPS (Q7)

PART 13: STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF ADVANTGE OR DISADVANTAGE IN APPOINTMENTS TO MANAGEMENT POSITIONS INVOLVING PERSONS IN LISTED GROUPS (Q8)

PART 14: STAFF PERCEPTION OF FACTORS THAT "MOST" AND "NEXT MOST" SERIOUSLY LIMIT RECRUITMENT OF NEW STAFF/ ADMINISTRATORS AMONG PEOPLE OF COLOR, WOMEN, AND DISABLED (Q12A & Q12B)

PART 15: SELECTED FREQUENCIES AND CROSSTABS BY LENGTH OF SERVICE AT SFSU

San Francisco State University

1600 HOLLOWAY AVENUE • SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94132

Public Research Institute

March 27, 1990

Dear Staff/Administrator:

This survey was requested by the Human Relations Commission as one way to learn about the state of human relations on this campus.

Your name was selected in a random sample of staff/administrators. Please take the 15 minutes or so required to fill out the enclosed questionnaire. Although your participation is voluntary, we strongly urge you to complete and return the questionnaire no later than April 20 so that the survey results will accurately represent the viewpoints of SFSU staff and administrators.

This survey is anonymous. The questionnaires have no code numbers. There is no way to link your name to your questionnaire. When we finish collecting the data, the mailing list will be destroyed. We urge you, therefore, to be completely frank and open in your answers to the questions.

The Public Research Institute will prepare a report of the survey results for the Human Relations Commission. The Commission will use those results in its report to the President. We expect the results to inform the campus community and to guide policy recommendations regarding human relations at San Francisco State University.

If you wish to receive a summary of the survey results, write "results requested" on a sheet of paper, print your name and address, and enclose it with your completed questionnaire. Please DO NOT put this information on the questionnaire itself.

If you have questions about the study, please call one of the faculty researchers: Dr. Richard DeLeon (338-7526), Dr. James Newton (338-7557), or Dr. Robert Smith (338-7524). If you would like bilingual assistance in completing this questionnaire, call Dr. DeLeon (338-7526). IF YOU ARE PRINT DISABLED, please call Mr. Cory Bytof (749-0567) for assistance.

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your willingness to express your views is very important to the work of the Human Relations Commission.

Sincerely,

Richard E. DeLeon

Richard E. DeLeon, Ph.D
Director

San Francisco State University
1600 HOLLOWAY AVENUE • SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94132

Public Research Institute

April 6, 1990

Dear Staff/Administrator:

About 10 days ago, the Public Research Institute (PRI) sent you a questionnaire about human relations on the S. F. State campus.

SFSU's Human Relations Commission arranged for PRI to conduct this anonymous sample survey of staff/administrator opinions as one important part of its broader study of human relations issues on campus. Your name was randomly selected from the University's current roster of staff/administrators.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire, please accept our sincere thanks.

If not, we ask that you do so no later than April 20.

If you did not receive the questionnaire, or if it has been lost or misplaced, please call PRI at 338-2978 or 338-7526, and we will send you one immediately.

If you are **PRINT DISABLED**, please call Mr. Cory Bytof (749-0567) for assistance. If you would like bilingual assistance, please call Dr. Richard DeLeon (338-7526).

Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,

Richard E. DeLeon

Richard E. DeLeon, Ph.D
Director

PART 10

ADDITIONAL SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

Table 1: Summary statistics -- age. 1
Table 2: Frequency distribution -- collective bargaining unit 1
Table 3: Frequency distribution -- education 1
Table 4: Frequency distribution -- religion 1
Table 5: Length of service at SFSU 2

ABLE 1: SUMMARY STATISTICS -- AGE.

ariable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
age	384	40.26	10.18	20.00	70.00

ABLE 2: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNIT.

q18	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
1	24	6.32	6.32
2	7	1.84	8.16
3	7	1.84	10.00
4	46	12.11	22.11
5	9	2.37	24.47
6	13	3.42	27.89
7	150	39.47	67.37
8	1	0.26	67.63
9	75	19.74	87.37
10	48	12.63	100.00
Total	380	100.00	

TABLE 3: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION EDUCATION

Highest Schooling Completed - R	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
< HS	30	7.52	7.52
HS	92	23.06	30.58
BA	167	41.85	72.43
MA	83	20.80	93.23
Ph.D	27	6.77	100.00
Total	399	100.00	

TABLE 4: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION RELIGION

relig	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Christn	186	50.13	50.13
Jewish	19	5.12	55.26
Islamic	2	0.54	55.80
None	122	32.88	88.68
Other	42	11.32	100.00
Total	371	100.00	

TABLE 5: LENGTH OF SERVICE AT SFSU

Length of Service at SFSU	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
< 6 yrs	187	47.58	47.58
6+ yrs	206	52.42	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

PART 11

STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF HOW LISTED GROUPS ARE TREATED BY THE SFSU CAMPUS COMMUNITY (Q1)

Question Text: "... In general, would you say that members of the following groups are treated better, about the same, or worse than the average person at SFSU by other members of the campus community?"

Table 1: Frequency distributions (Q1) 1
Table 2: Selected crosstabs (Q1) by race 5
Table 3: Selected crosstabs (Q1) by gender 9
Table 4: Selected crosstabs (Q1) by sexual identity 10
Table 5: Selected crosstabs (Q1) by religion 11
Table 6: Selected crosstabs (Q1) by disability 12
Table 7: Crosstabs (Q1) by management status 13

ABLE 1: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS (Q1): TREATMENT OF LISTED GROUPS BETTER, SAME, WORSE?

-> tabulation of q1arabs

Perceived reatment of Arabs	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	12	5.22	5.22
Same	149	64.78	70.00
Worse	69	30.00	100.00
Total	230	100.00	

> tabulation of q1asians

Perceived Treatment of Asians	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	56	17.18	17.18
Same	210	64.42	81.60
Worse	60	18.40	100.00
Total	326	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1pacifi

Perceived reatment of Pac Isl	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	15	6.20	6.20
Same	175	72.31	78.51
Worse	52	21.49	100.00
Total	242	100.00	

> tabulation of q1blacks

Perceived Treatment of Blacks	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	48	14.63	14.63
Same	162	49.39	64.02
Worse	118	35.98	100.00
Total	328	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1hispan

Perceived Treatment of Hispanic	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	19	5.90	5.90
Same	193	59.94	65.84
Worse	110	34.16	100.00
Total	322	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1natam

Perceived Treatment of Nat.Amer	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	17	6.75	6.75
Same	157	62.30	69.05
Worse	78	30.95	100.00
Total	252	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1filipi

Perceived Treatment of Filipino	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	37	12.01	12.01
Same	209	67.86	79.87
Worse	62	20.13	100.00
Total	308	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1whites

Perceived Treatment of Whites	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	146	42.32	42.32
Same	174	50.43	92.75
Worse	25	7.25	100.00
Total	345	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1men

Perceived Treatment of Men	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	143	41.21	41.21
Same	189	54.47	95.68
Worse	15	4.32	100.00
Total	347	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1women

Perceived Treatment of Women	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	29	8.38	8.38
Same	213	61.56	69.94
Worse	104	30.06	100.00
Total	346	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1gays

Perceived Treatment of Gays	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	48	16.22	16.22
Same	143	48.31	64.53
Worse	105	35.47	100.00
Total	296	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1fund

Perceived Treatment of Fund	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	13	6.74	6.74
Same	119	61.66	68.39
Worse	61	31.61	100.00
Total	193	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1jews

Perceived Treatment of Jews	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	21	10.55	10.55
Same	149	74.87	85.43
Worse	29	14.57	100.00
Total	199	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1muslim

Perceived Treatment of Muslims	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	12	6.00	6.00
Same	136	68.00	74.00
Worse	52	26.00	100.00
Total	200	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1disabl

Perceived Treatment of Disabled	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	53	18.66	18.66
Same	142	50.00	68.66
Worse	89	31.34	100.00
Total	284	100.00	

-> tabulation of q1foreig

Perceived Treatment of Foreigne	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Better	35	12.28	12.28
Same	157	55.09	67.37
Worse	93	32.63	100.00
Total	285	100.00	

TABLE 2: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q1) BY RACE

ARABS

Perceived Treatment of Arabs	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Better	1	2	1	5	2	11
	3.45	10.53	3.33	4.00	10.53	4.95
Same	16	11	17	88	10	142
	55.17	57.89	56.67	70.40	52.63	63.96
Worse	12	6	12	32	7	69
	41.38	31.58	40.00	25.60	36.84	31.08
Total	29	19	30	125	19	222
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 7.9731 Prob>chi2 = 0.436

ASIANS

Perceived Treatment of Asians	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Better	4	5	11	26	6	52
	6.67	18.52	26.19	16.25	24.00	16.56
Same	39	16	22	111	15	203
	65.00	59.26	52.38	69.38	60.00	64.65
Worse	17	6	9	23	4	59
	28.33	22.22	21.43	14.38	16.00	18.79
Total	60	27	42	160	25	314
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 13.5389 Prob>chi2 = 0.095

PACIFIC ISLANDERS

Perceived Treatment of Pac Isl	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Better	2	1	3	8	0	14
	5.26	4.35	10.34	6.35	0.00	6.03
Same	21	15	15	103	15	169
	55.26	65.22	51.72	81.75	93.75	72.84
Worse	15	7	11	15	1	49
	39.47	30.43	37.93	11.90	6.25	21.12
Total	38	23	29	126	16	232
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 25.5546 Prob>chi2 = 0.001

BLACKS

Perceived Treatment of Blacks	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Better	4	3	0	30	7	44
	7.02	11.11	0.00	18.63	25.00	13.92
Same	27	12	10	94	13	156
	47.37	44.44	23.26	58.39	46.43	49.37
Worse	26	12	33	37	8	116
	45.61	44.44	76.74	22.98	28.57	36.71
Total	57	27	43	161	28	316
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 51.1600 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

HISPANICS

Perceived Treatment of Hispanic	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Better	2	1	2	10	2	17
	3.64	3.03	4.88	6.54	7.41	5.50
Same	32	16	12	109	15	184
	58.18	48.48	29.27	71.24	55.56	59.55
Worse	21	16	27	34	10	108
	38.18	48.48	65.85	22.22	37.04	34.95
Total	55	33	41	153	27	309
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 32.0353 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

. NATIVE AMERICANS

Perceived Treatment of Nat.Amer	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Better	7	2	2	2	3	16
	14.89	9.09	6.25	1.65	14.29	6.58
Same	26	11	11	89	13	150
	55.32	50.00	34.38	73.55	61.90	61.73
Worse	14	9	19	30	5	77
	29.79	40.91	59.38	24.79	23.81	31.69
Total	47	22	32	121	21	243
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 29.5393 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

FILIPINOS

Perceived Treatment of Filipino	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Better	4	6	12	12	1	35
	6.90	23.08	31.58	8.11	4.00	11.86
Same	39	12	17	109	21	198
	67.24	46.15	44.74	73.65	84.00	67.12
Worse	15	8	9	27	3	62
	25.86	30.77	23.68	18.24	12.00	21.02
Total	58	26	38	148	25	295
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 29.4758 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

. FOREIGNERS

Perceived Treatment of Foreigne	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Better	4	0	6	18	5	33
	8.16	0.00	19.35	12.33	21.74	12.00
Same	20	13	14	93	11	151
	40.82	50.00	45.16	63.70	47.83	54.91
Worse	25	13	11	35	7	91
	51.02	50.00	35.48	23.97	30.43	33.09
Total	49	26	31	146	23	275
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 22.4146 Prob>chi2 = 0.004

WHITES

Perceived Treatment of Whites	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Better	39	14	37	42	11	143
	62.90	45.16	84.09	25.00	40.74	43.07
Same	23	16	7	109	12	167
	37.10	51.61	15.91	64.88	44.44	50.30
Worse	0	1	0	17	4	22
	0.00	3.23	0.00	10.12	14.81	6.63
Total	62	31	44	168	27	332
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 68.8324 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

TABLE 3: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q1) BY GENDER

MEN

Perceived Treatment of Men	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
Better	39	103	142
	30.23	48.58	41.64
Same	81	104	185
	62.79	49.06	54.25
Worse	9	5	14
	6.98	2.36	4.11
Total	129	212	341
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 13.4414 Prob>chi2 = 0.001

WOMEN

Perceived Treatment of Women	sex: Male	Female	Total
Better	21	7	28
	16.54	3.29	8.24
Same	83	126	209
	65.35	59.15	61.47
Worse	23	80	103
	18.11	37.56	30.29
Total	127	213	340
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 27.3900 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

TABLE 4: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q1) BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

. GAYS/LESBIANS

Perceived Treatment of Gays	gaybi: Gay/Bi	Straight	Total
Better	4	42	46
	7.69	18.92	16.79
Same	11	117	128
	21.15	52.70	46.72
Worse	37	63	100
	71.15	28.38	36.50
Total	52	222	274
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 33.2621 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

TABLE 5: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q1) BY RELIGION

FUNDAMENTALISTS

Perceived Treatment of Fund	relig Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
Better	10	0	0	3	0	13
	10.64	0.00	0.00	5.08	0.00	7.22
Same	53	11	0	36	10	110
	56.38	91.67	0.00	61.02	71.43	61.11
Worse	31	1	1	20	4	57
	32.98	8.33	100.00	33.90	28.57	31.67
Total	94	12	1	59	14	180
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(8) = 10.5983 Prob>chi2 = 0.226

JEWS

Perceived Treatment of Jews	relig Christn	Jewish	None	Other	Total
Better	10	0	2	7	19
	10.64	0.00	3.17	41.18	10.11
Same	71	12	50	8	141
	75.53	85.71	79.37	47.06	75.00
Worse	13	2	11	2	28
	13.83	14.29	17.46	11.76	14.89
Total	94	14	63	17	188
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(6) = 23.2875 Prob>chi2 = 0.001

MUSLIMS

Perceived Treatment of Muslims	relig Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
Better	6 6.12	2 14.29	0 0.00	2 3.51	2 11.76	12 6.38
Same	69 70.41	11 78.57	2 100.00	36 63.16	10 58.82	128 68.09
Worse	23 23.47	1 7.14	0 0.00	19 33.33	5 29.41	48 25.53
Total	98 100.00	14 100.00	2 100.00	57 100.00	17 100.00	188 100.00

chi2(8) = 8.0245 Prob>chi2 = 0.431

TABLE 6: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q1) BY DISABILITY

. DISABLED

Perceived Treatment of Disabled	disabled yes	no	Total
Better	3 16.67	48 18.97	51 18.82
Same	6 33.33	127 50.20	133 49.08
Worse	9 50.00	78 30.83	87 32.10
Total	18 100.00	253 100.00	271 100.00

chi2(2) = 2.9449 Prob>chi2 = 0.229

TABLE 7: CROSSTABS (Q1) BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

. ARABS

Perceived Treatment of Arabs	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	2	10	12
	6.25	5.38	5.50
Same	21	118	139
	65.63	63.44	63.76
Worse	9	58	67
	28.13	31.18	30.73
Total	32	186	218
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 0.1413 Prob>chi2 = 0.932

. ASIANS

Perceived Treatment of Asians	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	5	49	54
	11.90	18.08	17.25
Same	27	172	199
	64.29	63.47	63.58
Worse	10	50	60
	23.81	18.45	19.17
Total	42	271	313
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 1.3528 Prob>chi2 = 0.508

. PACIFIC ISLANDERS

Perceived Treatment of Pac Isl	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	1	14	15
	2.94	7.04	6.44
Same	25	141	166
	73.53	70.85	71.24
Worse	8	44	52
	23.53	22.11	22.32
Total	34	199	233
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 0.8114 Prob>chi2 = 0.667

. BLACKS

Perceived Treatment of Blacks	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	6	40	46
	14.63	14.60	14.60
Same	17	137	154
	41.46	50.00	48.89
Worse	18	97	115
	43.90	35.40	36.51
Total	41	274	315
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 1.2376 Prob>chi2 = 0.539

HISPANICS

Perceived Treatment of Hispanic	manage: Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	3 7.32	15 5.62	18 5.84
Same	24 58.54	158 59.18	182 59.09
Worse	14 34.15	94 35.21	108 35.06
Total	41 100.00	267 100.00	308 100.00

chi2(2) = 0.1894 Prob>chi2 = 0.910

. NATIVE AMERICANS

Perceived Treatment of Nat.Amer	manage: Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	1 3.03	16 7.69	17 7.05
Same	19 57.58	129 62.02	148 61.41
Worse	13 39.39	63 30.29	76 31.54
Total	33 100.00	208 100.00	241 100.00

chi2(2) = 1.7179 Prob>chi2 = 0.424

. FILIPINOS

Perceived Treatment of Filipino	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	4	32	36
	10.53	12.45	12.20
Same	23	175	198
	60.53	68.09	67.12
Worse	11	50	61
	28.95	19.46	20.68
Total	38	257	295
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 1.8254 Prob>chi2 = 0.401

. WHITES

Perceived Treatment of Whites	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	21	121	142
	50.00	42.01	43.03
Same	18	147	165
	42.86	51.04	50.00
Worse	3	20	23
	7.14	6.94	6.97
Total	42	288	330
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 1.0364 Prob>chi2 = 0.596

. MEN

Perceived Treatment of Men	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	16	123	139
	38.10	42.41	41.87
Same	24	156	180
	57.14	53.79	54.22
Worse	2	11	13
	4.76	3.79	3.92
Total	42	290	332
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 0.3273 Prob>chi2 = 0.849

. WOMEN

Perceived Treatment of Women	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	1	25	26
	2.38	8.65	7.85
Same	27	176	203
	64.29	60.90	61.33
Worse	14	88	102
	33.33	30.45	30.82
Total	42	289	331
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 2.0026 Prob>chi2 = 0.367

GAYS/LESBIANS

Perceived Treatment of Gays	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	6 14.63	41 16.87	47 16.55
Same	19 46.34	117 48.15	136 47.89
Worse	16 39.02	85 34.98	101 35.56
Total	41 100.00	243 100.00	284 100.00

chi2(2) = 0.2915 Prob>chi2 = 0.864

. FUNDAMENTALISTS

Perceived Treatment of Fund	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	2 8.00	11 6.88	13 7.03
Same	12 48.00	102 63.75	114 61.62
Worse	11 44.00	47 29.38	58 31.35
Total	25 100.00	160 100.00	185 100.00

chi2(2) = 2.3844 Prob>chi2 = 0.304

JEWS

Perceived Treatment of Jews	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	4	17	21
	14.29	10.18	10.77
Same	18	128	146
	64.29	76.65	74.87
Worse	6	22	28
	21.43	13.17	14.36
Total	28	167	195
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 2.0028 Prob>chi2 = 0.367

. MUSLIMS

Perceived Treatment of Muslims	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	1	11	12
	3.70	6.71	6.28
Same	20	108	128
	74.07	65.85	67.02
Worse	6	45	51
	22.22	27.44	26.70
Total	27	164	191
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 0.8030 Prob>chi2 = 0.669

. DISABLED

Perceived Treatment of Disabled	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	11	39	50
	28.95	16.67	18.38
Same	13	121	134
	34.21	51.71	49.26
Worse	14	74	88
	36.84	31.62	32.35
Total	38	234	272
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 4.9892 Prob>chi2 = 0.083

. FOREIGNERS

Perceived Treatment of Foreigne	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Better	3	31	34
	7.69	13.36	12.55
Same	17	131	148
	43.59	56.47	54.61
Worse	19	70	89
	48.72	30.17	32.84
Total	39	232	271
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(2) = 5.3656 Prob>chi2 = 0.068

PART 12

STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF ADVANTAGE OR DISADVANTAGE IN HIRING DECISIONS INVOLVING PERSONS IN LISTED GROUPS (Q7)

Question text: "In your opinion, are persons in each of the following groups advantaged or disadvantaged in hiring decisions by your department?"

Table 1: Frequency Distributions (Q7) 1
Table 2: Selected crosstabs (Q7) by race 5
Table 3: Selected crosstabs (Q7) by gender 9
Table 4: Selected crosstabs (Q7) by sexual identity 10
Table 5: Selected crosstabs (Q7) by religion 11
Table 6: Selected crosstabs (Q7) by disability 12
Table 7: Crosstabs (Q7) by management status 13

TABLE 1: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS (Q7): LISTED GROUPS ADVANTAGED OR DISADVANTGED IN HIRING DECISIONS?

-> tabulation of q7arabs

Arabs disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	18	4.69	4.69
No Diff	180	46.88	51.56
Disadvgd	42	10.94	62.50
DontKnow	144	37.50	100.00
Total	384	100.00	

-> tabulation of q7asians

Asians disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	102	26.42	26.42
No Diff	213	55.18	81.61
Disadvgd	31	8.03	89.64
DontKnow	40	10.36	100.00
Total	386	100.00	

-> tabulation of q7pacifi

Pacific Isldrs disadvtgd in hir	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	32	8.38	8.38
No Diff	203	53.14	61.52
Disadvgd	30	7.85	69.37
DontKnow	117	30.63	100.00
Total	382	100.00	

> tabulation of q7black

Blacks disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	87	22.60	22.60
No Diff	195	50.65	73.25
Disadvgd	74	19.22	92.47
DontKnow	29	7.53	100.00
Total	385	100.00	

> tabulation of q7hispan

Hispanics disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	60	15.71	15.71
No Diff	210	54.97	70.68
Disadvgd	63	16.49	87.17
DontKnow	49	12.83	100.00
Total	382	100.00	

> tabulation of q7natam

Native Amerns disadvtgd in hiri	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	42	10.94	10.94
No Diff	198	51.56	62.50
Disadvgd	53	13.80	76.30
DontKnow	91	23.70	100.00
Total	384	100.00	

> tabulation of q7filipi

Filipinos disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	62	16.19	16.19
No Diff	232	60.57	76.76
Disadvgd	34	8.88	85.64
DontKnow	55	14.36	100.00
Total	383	100.00	

-> tabulation of q7whites

Whites disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	102	26.56	26.56
No Diff	193	50.26	76.82
Disadvgd	65	16.93	93.75
DontKnow	24	6.25	100.00
Total	384	100.00	

-> tabulation of q7men

Men disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	101	26.44	26.44
No Diff	212	55.50	81.94
Disadvgd	47	12.30	94.24
DontKnow	22	5.76	100.00
Total	382	100.00	

-> tabulation of q7women

Women disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	79	20.47	20.47
No Diff	225	58.29	78.76
Disadvgd	56	14.51	93.26
DontKnow	26	6.74	100.00
Total	386	100.00	

-> tabulation of q7gays

Gays/Lesbians disadvtgd in hiri	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	38	9.87	9.87
No Diff	229	59.48	69.35
Disadvgd	54	14.03	83.38
DontKnow	64	16.62	100.00
Total	385	100.00	

-> tabulation of q7fund

Fundamentalists disadvtgd in hi	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	4	1.04	1.04
No Diff	187	48.70	49.74
Disadvgd	31	8.07	57.81
DontKnow	162	42.19	100.00
Total	384	100.00	

-> tabulation of q7jews

Jews disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	16	4.17	4.17
No Diff	235	61.20	65.36
Disadvgd	12	3.13	68.49
DontKnow	121	31.51	100.00
Total	384	100.00	

-> tabulation of q7muslim

Muslims disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	10	2.61	2.61
No Diff	185	48.30	50.91
Disadvgd	32	8.36	59.27
DontKnow	156	40.73	100.00
Total	383	100.00	

-> tabulation of q7disabl

Disabled disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	22	5.71	5.71
No Diff	181	47.01	52.73
Disadvgd	79	20.52	73.25
DontKnow	103	26.75	100.00
Total	385	100.00	

. tabulation of q7foreig

Foreigners disadvtgd in hiring?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	19	4.97	4.97
No Diff	191	50.00	54.97
Disadvgd	70	18.32	73.30
DontKnow	102	26.70	100.00
Total	382	100.00	

TABLE 2: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q7) BY RACE.

ARABS

Arabs disadvtgd in hiring?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	1 1.61	1 3.03	4 8.51	9 4.59	2 6.45	17 4.61
No Diff	19 30.65	13 39.39	16 34.04	108 55.10	15 48.39	171 46.34
Disadvgd	8 12.90	2 6.06	7 14.89	18 9.18	6 19.35	41 11.11
DontKnow	34 54.84	17 51.52	20 42.55	61 31.12	8 25.81	140 37.94
Total	62 100.00	33 100.00	47 100.00	196 100.00	31 100.00	369 100.00

chi2(12) = 25.8467 Prob>chi2 = 0.011

. ASIANS

Asians disadvtgd in hiring?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	13	11	16	50	10	100
	20.00	34.38	33.33	25.64	32.26	26.95
No Diff	33	19	22	112	17	203
	50.77	59.38	45.83	57.44	54.84	54.72
Disadvgd	14	1	1	11	2	29
	21.54	3.13	2.08	5.64	6.45	7.82
DontKnow	5	1	9	22	2	39
	7.69	3.13	18.75	11.28	6.45	10.51
Total	65	32	48	195	31	371
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 29.9400 Prob>chi2 = 0.003

. PACIFIC ISLANDERS

Pacific Isldrs disadvtgd in hir	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	3	1	4	21	3	32
	4.69	3.03	8.89	10.82	9.68	8.72
No Diff	30	18	21	107	18	194
	46.88	54.55	46.67	55.15	58.06	52.86
Disadvgd	11	3	1	11	2	28
	17.19	9.09	2.22	5.67	6.45	7.63
DontKnow	20	11	19	55	8	113
	31.25	33.33	42.22	28.35	25.81	30.79
Total	64	33	45	194	31	367
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 17.6903 Prob>chi2 = 0.125

BLACKS

Blacks disadvtgd in hiring?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	11	7	3	60	5	86
	17.19	21.21	6.38	30.77	16.13	23.24
No Diff	35	19	18	95	17	184
	54.69	57.58	38.30	48.72	54.84	49.73
Disadvgd	13	7	26	20	6	72
	20.31	21.21	55.32	10.26	19.35	19.46
DontKnow	5	0	0	20	3	28
	7.81	0.00	0.00	10.26	9.68	7.57
Total	64	33	47	195	31	370
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 62.1326 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

HISPANICS

Hispanics disadvtgd in hiring?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	10	3	5	37	4	59
	16.39	9.09	10.64	18.97	12.90	16.08
No Diff	34	18	20	108	20	200
	55.74	54.55	42.55	55.38	64.52	54.50
Disadvgd	13	9	16	19	4	61
	21.31	27.27	34.04	9.74	12.90	16.62
DontKnow	4	3	6	31	3	47
	6.56	9.09	12.77	15.90	9.68	12.81
Total	61	33	47	195	31	367
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 26.2866 Prob>chi2 = 0.010

. NATIVE AMERICANS

Native Amerns disadvtgd in hiri	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	9	0	4	22	5	40
	14.06	0.00	8.33	11.40	16.13	10.84
No Diff	31	17	18	105	18	189
	48.44	51.52	37.50	54.40	58.06	51.22
Disadvgd	8	7	14	19	3	51
	12.50	21.21	29.17	9.84	9.68	13.82
DontKnow	16	9	12	47	5	89
	25.00	27.27	25.00	24.35	16.13	24.12
Total	64	33	48	193	31	369
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 21.0047 Prob>chi2 = 0.050

. FILIPINOS

Filipinos disadvtgd in hiring?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	7	7	12	29	5	60
	11.11	21.21	26.09	14.87	16.13	16.30
No Diff	39	19	23	118	22	221
	61.90	57.58	50.00	60.51	70.97	60.05
Disadvgd	9	3	1	17	2	32
	14.29	9.09	2.17	8.72	6.45	8.70
DontKnow	8	4	10	31	2	55
	12.70	12.12	21.74	15.90	6.45	14.95
Total	63	33	46	195	31	368
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 14.0650 Prob>chi2 = 0.297

FOREIGNERS

Foreigners disadvtgd in hiring?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	2	0	7	7	2	18
	3.13	0.00	14.58	3.63	6.67	4.90
No Diff	23	16	19	106	18	182
	35.94	50.00	39.58	54.92	60.00	49.59
Disadvgd	17	4	7	34	6	68
	26.56	12.50	14.58	17.62	20.00	18.53
DontKnow	22	12	15	46	4	99
	34.38	37.50	31.25	23.83	13.33	26.98
Total	64	32	48	193	30	367
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 26.2167 Prob>chi2 = 0.010

TABLE 3: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q7) BY GENDER.

MEN

Men disadvtgd in hiring?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
Advntgd	31	69	100
	21.53	29.74	26.60
No Diff	86	123	209
	59.72	53.02	55.59
Disadvgd	18	27	45
	12.50	11.64	11.97
DontKnow	9	13	22
	6.25	5.60	5.85
Total	144	232	376
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 3.0911 Prob>chi2 = 0.378

. WOMEN

Women disadvtgd in hiring?	sex Male	Female	Total
Advntgd	39 26.53	39 16.74	78 20.53
No Diff	82 55.78	138 59.23	220 57.89
Disadvgd	14 9.52	42 18.03	56 14.74
DontKnow	12 8.16	14 6.01	26 6.84
Total	147 100.00	233 100.00	380 100.00

chi2(3) = 9.4281 Prob>chi2 = 0.024

TABLE 4: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q7) BY SEXUAL IDENTITY.

. GAYS/LESBIANS

Gays/Lesbians disadvtgd in hiri	gaybi Gay/Bi	Straight	Total
Advntgd	5 8.20	30 10.10	35 9.78
No Diff	27 44.26	186 62.63	213 59.50
Disadvgd	19 31.15	32 10.77	51 14.25
DontKnow	10 16.39	49 16.50	59 16.48
Total	61 100.00	297 100.00	358 100.00

chi2(3) = 17.8010 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

TABLE 5: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q7) BY RELIGION.

FUNDAMENTALISTS

fundamentalists disadvtgd in hi	relig					
	Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
Advntgd	2 1.10	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 1.72	0 0.00	4 1.11
No Diff	93 51.10	11 64.71	2 100.00	54 46.55	17 40.48	177 49.30
Disadvgd	12 6.59	0 0.00	0 0.00	13 11.21	4 9.52	29 8.08
DontKnow	75 41.21	6 35.29	0 0.00	47 40.52	21 50.00	149 41.50
Total	182 100.00	17 100.00	2 100.00	116 100.00	42 100.00	359 100.00

chi2(12) = 9.1843 Prob>chi2 = 0.687

JEWS

Jews disadvtgd in hiring?	relig					
	Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
Advntgd	7 3.87	0 0.00	0 0.00	4 3.42	4 9.52	15 4.18
No Diff	118 65.19	13 76.47	2 100.00	70 59.83	20 47.62	223 62.12
Disadvgd	4 2.21	1 5.88	0 0.00	4 3.42	1 2.38	10 2.79
DontKnow	52 28.73	3 17.65	0 0.00	39 33.33	17 40.48	111 30.92
Total	181 100.00	17 100.00	2 100.00	117 100.00	42 100.00	359 100.00

chi2(12) = 11.0693 Prob>chi2 = 0.523

MUSLIMS

Muslims disadvtgd in hiring?	relig Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
Advntgd	6 3.31	1 5.88	0 0.00	2 1.71	1 2.38	10 2.79
No Diff	93 51.38	10 58.82	2 100.00	54 46.15	15 35.71	174 48.47
Disadvgd	13 7.18	1 5.88	0 0.00	9 7.69	4 9.52	27 7.52
DontKnow	69 38.12	5 29.41	0 0.00	52 44.44	22 52.38	148 41.23
Total	181 100.00	17 100.00	2 100.00	117 100.00	42 100.00	359 100.00

chi2(12) = 8.5141 Prob>chi2 = 0.744

TABLE 6: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q7) BY DISABILITY.

DISABLED

Disabled disadvtgd in hiring?	disabled yes	no	Total
Advntgd	2 10.00	19 5.49	21 5.74
No Diff	12 60.00	162 46.82	174 47.54
Disadvgd	5 25.00	72 20.81	77 21.04
DontKnow	1 5.00	93 26.88	94 25.68
Total	20 100.00	346 100.00	366 100.00

chi2(3) = 5.0423 Prob>chi2 = 0.169

TABLE 7: CROSSTABS (Q7) BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

ARABS

Arabs disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	2	14	16
	4.26	4.36	4.35
No Diff	28	142	170
	59.57	44.24	46.20
Disadvgd	7	35	42
	14.89	10.90	11.41
DontKnow	10	130	140
	21.28	40.50	38.04
Total	47	321	368
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 6.6424 Prob>chi2 = 0.084

ASIANS

Asians disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	16	83	99
	34.78	25.62	26.76
No Diff	25	176	201
	54.35	54.32	54.32
Disadvgd	4	27	31
	8.70	8.33	8.38
DontKnow	1	38	39
	2.17	11.73	10.54
Total	46	324	370
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 4.7596 Prob>chi2 = 0.190

. PACIFIC ISLANDERS

Pacific Isldrs disadvtgd in hir	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	7 15.56	24 7.48	31 8.47
No Diff	24 53.33	170 52.96	194 53.01
Disadvgd	7 15.56	23 7.17	30 8.20
DontKnow	7 15.56	104 32.40	111 30.33
Total	45 100.00	321 100.00	366 100.00

chi2(3) = 10.1240 Prob>chi2 = 0.018

. BLACKS

Blacks disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	14 30.43	70 21.67	84 22.76
No Diff	23 50.00	162 50.15	185 50.14
Disadvgd	9 19.57	63 19.50	72 19.51
DontKnow	0 0.00	28 8.67	28 7.59
Total	46 100.00	323 100.00	369 100.00

chi2(3) = 5.3461 Prob>chi2 = 0.148

. HISPANICS

Hispanics disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	10	47	57
	21.74	14.69	15.57
No Diff	24	175	199
	52.17	54.69	54.37
Disadvgd	8	54	62
	17.39	16.88	16.94
DontKnow	4	44	48
	8.70	13.75	13.11
Total	46	320	366
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 2.1206 Prob>chi2 = 0.548

. NATIVE AMERICANS

Native Amerns disadvtgd in hiri	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	8	33	41
	17.39	10.25	11.14
No Diff	23	165	188
	50.00	51.24	51.09
Disadvgd	9	44	53
	19.57	13.66	14.40
DontKnow	6	80	86
	13.04	24.84	23.37
Total	46	322	368
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 5.2271 Prob>chi2 = 0.156

FILIPINOS

Filipinos disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	10 21.74	50 15.58	60 16.35
No Diff	28 60.87	193 60.12	221 60.22
Disadvgd	4 8.70	29 9.03	33 8.99
DontKnow	4 8.70	49 15.26	53 14.44
Total	46 100.00	321 100.00	367 100.00

chi2(3) = 2.1458 Prob>chi2 = 0.543

WHITES

Whites disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	15 33.33	84 26.01	99 26.90
No Diff	22 48.89	161 49.85	183 49.73
Disadvgd	7 15.56	56 17.34	63 17.12
DontKnow	1 2.22	22 6.81	23 6.25
Total	45 100.00	323 100.00	368 100.00

chi2(3) = 2.1995 Prob>chi2 = 0.532

MEN

Men disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	14 31.11	85 26.48	99 27.05
No Diff	28 62.22	174 54.21	202 55.19
Disadvgd	3 6.67	41 12.77	44 12.02
DontKnow	0 0.00	21 6.54	21 5.74
Total	45 100.00	321 100.00	366 100.00

chi2(3) = 4.9404 Prob>chi2 = 0.176

WOMEN

Women disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	8 17.39	68 20.99	76 20.54
No Diff	29 63.04	185 57.10	214 57.84
Disadvgd	8 17.39	47 14.51	55 14.86
DontKnow	1 2.17	24 7.41	25 6.76
Total	46 100.00	324 100.00	370 100.00

chi2(3) = 2.3582 Prob>chi2 = 0.501

. GAYS/LESBIANS

Gays/Lesbians disadvtgd in hiri	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	2	34	36
	4.44	10.49	9.76
No Diff	31	188	219
	68.89	58.02	59.35
Disadvgd	10	42	52
	22.22	12.96	14.09
DontKnow	2	60	62
	4.44	18.52	16.80
Total	45	324	369
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 9.3298 Prob>chi2 = 0.025

. FUNDAMENTALISTS

Fundamentalists disadvtgd in hi	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	0	3	3
	0.00	0.93	0.82
No Diff	24	156	180
	52.17	48.45	48.91
Disadvgd	8	19	27
	17.39	5.90	7.34
DontKnow	14	144	158
	30.43	44.72	42.93
Total	46	322	368
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 9.6994 Prob>chi2 = 0.021

. JEWS

Jews disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	1	14	15
	2.17	4.35	4.08
No Diff	34	194	228
	73.91	60.25	61.96
Disadvgd	2	8	10
	4.35	2.48	2.72
DontKnow	9	106	115
	19.57	32.92	31.25
Total	46	322	368
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 4.4909 Prob>chi2 = 0.213

. MUSLIMS

Muslims disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	2	7	9
	4.35	2.18	2.45
No Diff	28	148	176
	60.87	46.11	47.96
Disadvgd	5	27	32
	10.87	8.41	8.72
DontKnow	11	139	150
	23.91	43.30	40.87
Total	46	321	367
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 6.5788 Prob>chi2 = 0.087

. DISABLED

Disabled disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	4 8.70	16 4.95	20 5.42
No Diff	25 54.35	146 45.20	171 46.34
Disadvgd	10 21.74	68 21.05	78 21.14
DontKnow	7 15.22	93 28.79	100 27.10
Total	46 100.00	323 100.00	369 100.00

chi2(3) = 4.5143 Prob>chi2 = 0.211

. FOREIGNERS

Foreigners disadvtgd in hiring?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	0 0.00	17 5.30	17 4.64
No Diff	21 46.67	160 49.84	181 49.45
Disadvgd	16 35.56	53 16.51	69 18.85
DontKnow	8 17.78	91 28.35	99 27.05
Total	45 100.00	321 100.00	366 100.00

chi2(3) = 11.6873 Prob>chi2 = 0.009

PART 13

STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF ADVANTAGE OR DISADVANTAGE IN APPOINTMENTS TO MANAGEMENT POSITIONS INVOLVING PERSONS IN LISTED GROUPS (Q8)

Question text: "In your opinion, are persons in each of the following groups advantaged or disadvantaged in appointments to management positions in the University?"

Table 1: Frequency distributions (Q8) 1
Table 2: Selected crosstabs (Q8) by race 5
Table 3: Selected crosstabs (Q8) by gender 10
Table 4: Selected crosstabs (Q8) by sexual identity 11
Table 5: Selected crosstabs (Q8) by religion 11
Table 6: Selected crosstabs (Q8) by disability 13
Table 7: Crosstabs (Q8) by management status 13

TABLE 1: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS (Q8): LISTED GROUPS ADVANTAGED OR DISADVANTAGED IN APPOINTMENTS TO MANAGEMENT POSITIONS?

-> tabulation of q8arabs

Arabs disadvtged in mgmt apts?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	8	2.05	2.05
No Diff	94	24.10	26.15
Disadvgd	81	20.77	46.92
DontKnow	207	53.08	100.00
Total	390	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8asians

Asians disadvtged in mgmt apts?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	73	18.81	18.81
No Diff	124	31.96	50.77
Disadvgd	94	24.23	75.00
DontKnow	97	25.00	100.00
Total	388	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8pacifi

Pac Isldrs disadvtged in mgmt a	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	17	4.38	4.38
No Diff	108	27.84	32.22
Disadvgd	85	21.91	54.12
DontKnow	178	45.88	100.00
Total	388	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8blacks

Blacks disadvtged in mgmt apts?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	95	24.36	24.36
No Diff	92	23.59	47.95
Disadvgd	130	33.33	81.28
DontKnow	73	18.72	100.00
Total	390	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8hispan

Hispanics disadvtged in mgmt ap	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	51	13.08	13.08
No Diff	101	25.90	38.97
Disadvgd	140	35.90	74.87
DontKnow	98	25.13	100.00
Total	390	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8natam

Nat Amercns disadvtged in mgmt	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	28	7.27	7.27
No Diff	108	28.05	35.32
Disadvgd	111	28.83	64.16
DontKnow	138	35.84	100.00
Total	385	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8filipi

Filipinos disadvtged in mgmt ap	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	57	14.73	14.73
No Diff	125	32.30	47.03
Disadvgd	91	23.51	70.54
DontKnow	114	29.46	100.00
Total	387	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8whites

Whites disadvtged in mgmt apts?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	184	47.06	47.06
No Diff	91	23.27	70.33
Disadvgd	51	13.04	83.38
DontKnow	65	16.62	100.00
Total	391	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8men

Men disadvtged in mgmt apts?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	176	44.78	44.78
No Diff	112	28.50	73.28
Disadvgd	38	9.67	82.95
DontKnow	67	17.05	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8women

Women disadvtged in mgmt apts?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	49	12.56	12.56
No Diff	139	35.64	48.21
Disadvgd	122	31.28	79.49
DontKnow	80	20.51	100.00
Total	390	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8gays

Gays/Lesbian disadvtged in mgm	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	49	12.56	12.56
No Diff	131	33.59	46.15
Disadvgd	78	20.00	66.15
DontKnow	132	33.85	100.00
Total	390	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8fund

Fundamentalists disadvtged in m	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	7	1.80	1.80
No Diff	111	28.61	30.41
Disadvgd	33	8.51	38.92
DontKnow	237	61.08	100.00
Total	388	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8jews

Jews disadvtged in mgmt apts?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	28	7.20	7.20
No Diff	153	39.33	46.53
Disadvgd	19	4.88	51.41
DontKnow	189	48.59	100.00
Total	389	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8muslim

Muslims disadvtged in mgmt apts	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	7	1.82	1.82
No Diff	105	27.27	29.09
Disadvgd	62	16.10	45.19
DontKnow	211	54.81	100.00
Total	385	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8disabl

Disabled disadvtged in mgmt apt	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	20	5.12	5.12
No Diff	107	27.37	32.48
Disadvgd	108	27.62	60.10
DontKnow	156	39.90	100.00
Total	391	100.00	

-> tabulation of q8foreig

Foreigners disadvtged in mgmt a	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Advntgd	11	2.82	2.82
No Diff	95	24.36	27.18
Disadvgd	113	28.97	56.15
DontKnow	171	43.85	100.00
Total	390	100.00	

TABLE 2: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q8) BY RACE.

. ARABS

Arabs disadvtged in mgmt apts?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	0	0	1	2	3	6
	0.00	0.00	2.08	1.01	9.68	1.60
No Diff	7	6	6	66	5	90
	10.77	18.18	12.50	33.33	16.13	24.00
Disadvgd	12	8	18	34	6	78
	18.46	24.24	37.50	17.17	19.35	20.80
DontKnow	46	19	23	96	17	201
	70.77	57.58	47.92	48.48	54.84	53.60
Total	65	33	48	198	31	375
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 43.5641 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

. ASIANS

Asians disadvtged in mgmt apts?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	1	6	9	48	5	69
	1.56	18.18	18.75	24.24	16.13	18.45
No Diff	13	12	15	73	9	122
	20.31	36.36	31.25	36.87	29.03	32.62
Disadvgd	36	9	12	27	7	91
	56.25	27.27	25.00	13.64	22.58	24.33
DontKnow	14	6	12	50	10	92
	21.88	18.18	25.00	25.25	32.26	24.60
Total	64	33	48	198	31	374
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 55.7407 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

. PACIFIC ISLANDERS

Pac Isldrs disadvtged in mgmt a	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	1	2	2	9	2	16
	1.54	6.06	4.17	4.57	6.45	4.28
No Diff	12	9	8	66	9	104
	18.46	27.27	16.67	33.50	29.03	27.81
Disadvgd	21	9	18	29	5	82
	32.31	27.27	37.50	14.72	16.13	21.93
DontKnow	31	13	20	93	15	172
	47.69	39.39	41.67	47.21	48.39	45.99
Total	65	33	48	197	31	374
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(12) = 22.9960 Prob>chi2 = 0.028

. BLACKS

Blacks disadvtged in mgmt apts?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	7 10.77	4 12.12	3 6.25	70 35.35	6 19.35	90 24.00
No Diff	16 24.62	10 30.30	3 6.25	49 24.75	9 29.03	87 23.20
Disadvgd	30 46.15	12 36.36	40 83.33	38 19.19	9 29.03	129 34.40
DontKnow	12 18.46	7 21.21	2 4.17	41 20.71	7 22.58	69 18.40
Total	65 100.00	33 100.00	48 100.00	198 100.00	31 100.00	375 100.00

chi2(12) = 87.1973 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

. HISPANICS

Hispanics disadvtged in mgmt ap	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	5 7.69	2 6.06	1 2.08	37 18.69	3 9.68	48 12.80
No Diff	15 23.08	9 27.27	5 10.42	59 29.80	8 25.81	96 25.60
Disadvgd	26 40.00	16 48.48	36 75.00	48 24.24	11 35.48	137 36.53
DontKnow	19 29.23	6 18.18	6 12.50	54 27.27	9 29.03	94 25.07
Total	65 100.00	33 100.00	48 100.00	198 100.00	31 100.00	375 100.00

chi2(12) = 52.1016 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

. NATIVE AMERICANS

Nat Amercns disadvtged in mgmt	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	4 6.35	1 3.13	2 4.17	16 8.12	3 10.00	26 7.03
No Diff	16 25.40	8 25.00	4 8.33	63 31.98	11 36.67	102 27.57
Disadvgd	23 36.51	14 43.75	28 58.33	37 18.78	6 20.00	108 29.19
DontKnow	20 31.75	9 28.13	14 29.17	81 41.12	10 33.33	134 36.22
Total	63 100.00	32 100.00	48 100.00	197 100.00	30 100.00	370 100.00

chi2(12) = 39.5107 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

. FILIPINOS

Filipinos disadvtged in mgmt ap	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	6 9.38	4 12.50	8 17.02	29 14.65	6 19.35	53 14.25
No Diff	20 31.25	9 28.13	10 21.28	73 36.87	9 29.03	121 32.53
Disadvgd	24 37.50	10 31.25	15 31.91	33 16.67	6 19.35	88 23.66
DontKnow	14 21.88	9 28.13	14 29.79	63 31.82	10 32.26	110 29.57
Total	64 100.00	32 100.00	47 100.00	198 100.00	31 100.00	372 100.00

chi2(12) = 18.6649 Prob>chi2 = 0.097

. FOREIGNERS

Foreigners disadvtged in mgmt a	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 4.17	7 3.52	2 6.45	11 2.93
No Diff	9 14.06	6 18.18	10 20.83	58 29.15	7 22.58	90 24.00
Disadvgd	29 45.31	12 36.36	13 27.08	49 24.62	7 22.58	110 29.33
DontKnow	26 40.63	15 45.45	23 47.92	85 42.71	15 48.39	164 43.73
Total	64 100.00	33 100.00	48 100.00	199 100.00	31 100.00	375 100.00

chi2(12) = 18.9084 Prob>chi2 = 0.091

. WHITES

Whites disadvtged in mgmt apts?	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
Advntgd	41 64.06	21 63.64	41 85.42	64 32.00	13 41.94	180 47.87
No Diff	13 20.31	9 27.27	5 10.42	51 25.50	9 29.03	87 23.14
Disadvgd	1 1.56	1 3.03	0 0.00	43 21.50	3 9.68	48 12.77
DontKnow	9 14.06	2 6.06	2 4.17	42 21.00	6 19.35	61 16.22
Total	64 100.00	33 100.00	48 100.00	200 100.00	31 100.00	376 100.00

chi2(12) = 71.5127 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

TABLE 3: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q8) BY GENDER

. MEN

Men disadvtged in mgmt apts?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
Advntgd	56 37.58	116 48.74	172 44.44
No Diff	46 30.87	65 27.31	111 28.68
Disadvgd	16 10.74	21 8.82	37 9.56
DontKnow	31 20.81	36 15.13	67 17.31
Total	149 100.00	238 100.00	387 100.00

chi2(3) = 5.0296 Prob>chi2 = 0.170

. WOMEN

Women disadvtged in mgmt apts?	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
Advntgd	28 18.79	19 8.09	47 12.24
No Diff	48 32.21	88 37.45	136 35.42
Disadvgd	35 23.49	86 36.60	121 31.51
DontKnow	38 25.50	42 17.87	80 20.83
Total	149 100.00	235 100.00	384 100.00

chi2(3) = 16.7644 Prob>chi2 = 0.001

ABLE 4: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q8) BY SEXUAL IDENTITY

GAYS/LESBIANS

ays/Lesbians disadvtged in mgm	gaybi: Gay/Bi	Straight	Total
Advntgd	3 4.84	42 13.95	45 12.40
No Diff	15 24.19	108 35.88	123 33.88
Disadvgd	30 48.39	42 13.95	72 19.83
DontKnow	14 22.58	109 36.21	123 33.88
Total	62 100.00	301 100.00	363 100.00

chi2(3) = 39.0692 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

ABLE 5: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q8) BY RELIGION

FUNDAMENTALISTS

undamentalists disadvtged in m	relig: Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
Advntgd	5 2.73	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 1.69	0 0.00	7 1.93
No Diff	57 31.15	8 42.11	1 50.00	28 23.73	11 26.83	105 28.93
Disadvgd	16 8.74	1 5.26	0 0.00	13 11.02	2 4.88	32 8.82
DontKnow	105 57.38	10 52.63	1 50.00	75 63.56	28 68.29	219 60.33
Total	183 100.00	19 100.00	2 100.00	118 100.00	41 100.00	363 100.00

chi2(12) = 7.7071 Prob>chi2 = 0.808

JEWS

Jews disadvtged in mgmt apts?	relig					
	Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
Advntgd	14 7.65	0 0.00	0 0.00	6 5.08	6 14.29	26 7.14
No Diff	77 42.08	11 57.89	1 50.00	40 33.90	12 28.57	141 38.74
Disadvgd	7 3.83	2 10.53	0 0.00	8 6.78	1 2.38	18 4.95
DontKnow	85 46.45	6 31.58	1 50.00	64 54.24	23 54.76	179 49.18
Total	183 100.00	19 100.00	2 100.00	118 100.00	42 100.00	364 100.00

chi2(12) = 14.9682 Prob>chi2 = 0.243

. MUSLIMS

Muslims disadvtged in mgmt apts	relig					
	Christn	Jewish	Islamic	None	Other	Total
Advntgd	5 2.79	1 5.26	0 0.00	1 0.85	0 0.00	7 1.94
No Diff	56 31.28	9 47.37	1 50.00	23 19.49	10 23.81	99 27.50
Disadvgd	24 13.41	3 15.79	0 0.00	25 21.19	5 11.90	57 15.83
DontKnow	94 52.51	6 31.58	1 50.00	69 58.47	27 64.29	197 54.72
Total	179 100.00	19 100.00	2 100.00	118 100.00	42 100.00	360 100.00

chi2(12) = 16.8731 Prob>chi2 = 0.154

TABLE 6: SELECTED CROSSTABS (Q8) BY DISABILITY

. DISABLED

Disabled disadvtged in mgmt apt	disabled yes	no	Total
Advntgd	2 9.52	16 4.56	18 4.84
No Diff	3 14.29	99 28.21	102 27.42
Disadvgd	8 38.10	93 26.50	101 27.15
DontKnow	8 38.10	143 40.74	151 40.59
Total	21 100.00	351 100.00	372 100.00

chi2(3) = 3.4259 Prob>chi2 = 0.331

TABLE 7: CROSSTABS (Q8) BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

. ARABS

Arabs disadvtged in mgmt apts?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	0 0.00	6 1.84	6 1.60
No Diff	18 37.50	70 21.47	88 23.53
Disadvgd	9 18.75	72 22.09	81 21.66
DontKnow	21 43.75	178 54.60	199 53.21
Total	48 100.00	326 100.00	374 100.00

chi2(3) = 6.5922 Prob>chi2 = 0.086

. ASIANS

Asians disadvtged in mgmt apts?	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	15	54	69
	31.25	16.67	18.55
No Diff	16	100	116
	33.33	30.86	31.18
Disadvgd	12	81	93
	25.00	25.00	25.00
DontKnow	5	89	94
	10.42	27.47	25.27
Total	48	324	372
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 9.6862 Prob>chi2 = 0.021

. PACIFIC ISLANDERS

Pac Isldrs disadvtged in mgmt a	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	4	12	16
	8.33	3.69	4.29
No Diff	16	86	102
	33.33	26.46	27.35
Disadvgd	14	71	85
	29.17	21.85	22.79
DontKnow	14	156	170
	29.17	48.00	45.58
Total	48	325	373
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 7.0607 Prob>chi2 = 0.070

. BLACKS

Blacks disadvtged in mgmt apts?	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	16	75	91
	33.33	23.01	24.33
No Diff	13	73	86
	27.08	22.39	22.99
Disadvgd	14	113	127
	29.17	34.66	33.96
DontKnow	5	65	70
	10.42	19.94	18.72
Total	48	326	374
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 4.6333 Prob>chi2 = 0.201

. HISPANICS

Hispanics disadvtged in mgmt ap	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	11	37	48
	22.92	11.35	12.83
No Diff	13	81	94
	27.08	24.85	25.13
Disadvgd	17	120	137
	35.42	36.81	36.63
DontKnow	7	88	95
	14.58	26.99	25.40
Total	48	326	374
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 7.0041 Prob>chi2 = 0.072

. NATIVE AMERICANS

Nat Amercns disadvtged in mgmt	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	6 12.50	21 6.54	27 7.32
No Diff	16 33.33	83 25.86	99 26.83
Disadvgd	13 27.08	97 30.22	110 29.81
DontKnow	13 27.08	120 37.38	133 36.04
Total	48 100.00	321 100.00	369 100.00

chi2(3) = 4.2624 Prob>chi2 = 0.234

. FILIPINOS

Filipinos disadvtged in mgmt ap	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	11 22.92	43 13.31	54 14.56
No Diff	18 37.50	100 30.96	118 31.81
Disadvgd	12 25.00	79 24.46	91 24.53
DontKnow	7 14.58	101 31.27	108 29.11
Total	48 100.00	323 100.00	371 100.00

chi2(3) = 7.2121 Prob>chi2 = 0.065

. WHITES

Whites disadvtged in mgmt apts?	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	23	157	180
	47.92	48.01	48.00
No Diff	14	70	84
	29.17	21.41	22.40
Disadvgd	8	40	48
	16.67	12.23	12.80
DontKnow	3	60	63
	6.25	18.35	16.80
Total	48	327	375
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 5.4151 Prob>chi2 = 0.144

. MEN

Men disadvtged in mgmt apts?	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	17	155	172
	35.42	47.11	45.62
No Diff	19	86	105
	39.58	26.14	27.85
Disadvgd	10	25	35
	20.83	7.60	9.28
DontKnow	2	63	65
	4.17	19.15	17.24
Total	48	329	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 17.3306 Prob>chi2 = 0.001

. WOMEN

Women disadvtged in mgmt apts?	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	9	38	47
	18.75	11.66	12.57
No Diff	26	106	132
	54.17	32.52	35.29
Disadvgd	10	107	117
	20.83	32.82	31.28
DontKnow	3	75	78
	6.25	23.01	20.86
Total	48	326	374
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 14.7874 Prob>chi2 = 0.002

. GAYS/LESBIANS

Gays/Lesbians disadvtged in mgm	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	4	42	46
	8.33	12.88	12.30
No Diff	25	99	124
	52.08	30.37	33.16
Disadvgd	11	65	76
	22.92	19.94	20.32
DontKnow	8	120	128
	16.67	36.81	34.22
Total	48	326	374
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 11.7978 Prob>chi2 = 0.008

. FUNDAMENTALISTS

Fundamentalists disadvtged in m	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	1	5	6
	2.08	1.54	1.61
No Diff	19	88	107
	39.58	27.16	28.76
Disadvgd	7	22	29
	14.58	6.79	7.80
DontKnow	21	209	230
	43.75	64.51	61.83
Total	48	324	372
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 8.4888 Prob>chi2 = 0.037

. JEWS

Jews disadvtged in mgmt apts?	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	5	22	27
	10.42	6.77	7.24
No Diff	23	123	146
	47.92	37.85	39.14
Disadvgd	2	15	17
	4.17	4.62	4.56
DontKnow	18	165	183
	37.50	50.77	49.06
Total	48	325	373
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 3.3717 Prob>chi2 = 0.338

MUSLIMS

Muslims disadvtged in mgmt apts	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	0 0.00	6 1.86	6 1.62
No Diff	21 43.75	77 23.91	98 26.49
Disadvgd	7 14.58	55 17.08	62 16.76
DontKnow	20 41.67	184 57.14	204 55.14
Total	48 100.00	322 100.00	370 100.00

chi2(3) = 9.0707 Prob>chi2 = 0.028

. DISABLED

Disabled disadvtged in mgmt apt	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	2 4.17	16 4.89	18 4.80
No Diff	19 39.58	81 24.77	100 26.67
Disadvgd	15 31.25	91 27.83	106 28.27
DontKnow	12 25.00	139 42.51	151 40.27
Total	48 100.00	327 100.00	375 100.00

chi2(3) = 6.8494 Prob>chi2 = 0.077

. FOREIGNERS

Foreigners disadvtged in mgmt a	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
Advntgd	0	10	10
	0.00	3.07	2.67
No Diff	16	71	87
	33.33	21.78	23.26
Disadvgd	19	93	112
	39.58	28.53	29.95
DontKnow	13	152	165
	27.08	46.63	44.12
Total	48	326	374
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 9.2031 Prob>chi2 = 0.027

PART 14

STAFF PERCEPTION OF FACTORS THAT "MOST" AND "NEXT MOST" SERIOUSLY LIMIT RECRUITMENT OF NEW STAFF/ADMINISTRATORS AMONG PEOPLE OF COLOR, WOMEN, AND DISABLED (Q12A & Q12B)

Question text: Q12A "In your judgment, whch of these factors [specified in Q12], if any, most seriously limits recruitment of new staff/administrators from the groups named above?"

Q12B "In your judgment, which of these factors [specified in Q12], if any, next most seriously limits recruitment of new staff/administrators from the groups named above?"

Table 1: Frequency distributions (Q12A & Q12B)	1
Table 2: Crosstab (Q12A) by race	2
Table 3: Crosstab (Q12A) by gender	3
Table 4: Crosstab (Q12A) by disability	4
Table 5: Crosstab (Q12A) by management status	5
Table 6: Crosstab (Q12B) by race	6
Table 7: Crosstab (Q12B) by gender	7
Table 8: Crosstab (Q12B) by disability	8
Table 9: Crosstab (Q12B) by management status	9

TABLE 1: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS (Q12A & Q12B): FACTORS THAT "MOST" AND "NEXT MOST" SERIOUSLY LIMIT RECRUITMENT OF NEW STAFF/ ADMINISTRATORS FROM LISTED GROUPS (PEOPLE OF COLOR, WOMEN, DISABLED)

Factor MOST limit recrtment min	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
None	100	27.32	27.32
ScarcMem	78	21.31	48.63
LackSpec	16	4.37	53.01
LessQual	10	2.73	55.74
InsufInt	27	7.38	63.11
MoreTime	34	9.29	72.40
OvertPre	32	8.74	81.15
ImplDisc	45	12.30	93.44
Other#1	11	3.01	96.45
Other#2	13	3.55	100.00
Total	366	100.00	

Fact NEXT MOST limit rctmnt min	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
None	122	33.98	33.98
ScarcMem	39	10.86	44.85
LackSpec	37	10.31	55.15
LessQual	18	5.01	60.17
InsufInt	29	8.08	68.25
MoreTime	37	10.31	78.55
OvertPre	38	10.58	89.14
ImplDisc	17	4.74	93.87
Other#1	8	2.23	96.10
Other#2	14	3.90	100.00
Total	359	100.00	

TABLE 2: CROSSTABS (Q12A - "MOST" SERIOUS) BY RACE

Factor MOST limit recrtment min	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
None	17 27.87	7 22.58	8 18.60	50 26.88	10 34.48	92 26.29
ScarcMem	11 18.03	6 19.35	1 2.33	54 29.03	5 17.24	77 22.00
LackSpec	2 3.28	3 9.68	1 2.33	9 4.84	1 3.45	16 4.57
LessQual	2 3.28	0 0.00	0 0.00	8 4.30	0 0.00	10 2.86
InsufInt	5 8.20	2 6.45	4 9.30	10 5.38	3 10.34	24 6.86
MoreTime	5 8.20	3 9.68	6 13.95	16 8.60	3 10.34	33 9.43
OvertPre	8 13.11	2 6.45	8 18.60	11 5.91	2 6.90	31 8.86
ImplDisc	7 11.48	6 19.35	12 27.91	17 9.14	1 3.45	43 12.29
Other#1	2 3.28	1 3.23	1 2.33	4 2.15	3 10.34	11 3.14
Other#2	2 3.28	1 3.23	2 4.65	7 3.76	1 3.45	13 3.71
Total	61 100.00	31 100.00	43 100.00	186 100.00	29 100.00	350 100.00

chi2(36) = 51.0989 Prob>chi2 = 0.049

TABLE 3: CROSSTABS (Q12A - "MOST SERIOUS) BY GENDER

Factor MOST limit recrtment min	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
None	34 23.61	64 29.63	98 27.22
ScarcMem	37 25.69	40 18.52	77 21.39
LackSpec	12 8.33	4 1.85	16 4.44
LessQual	2 1.39	8 3.70	10 2.78
InsufInt	11 7.64	15 6.94	26 7.22
MoreTime	8 5.56	26 12.04	34 9.44
OvertPre	10 6.94	22 10.19	32 8.89
ImplDisc	20 13.89	23 10.65	43 11.94
Other#1	3 2.08	8 3.70	11 3.06
Other#2	7 4.86	6 2.78	13 3.61
Total	144 100.00	216 100.00	360 100.00

chi2(9) = 20.5253 Prob>chi2 = 0.015

TABLE 4: CROSSTABS (Q12A - "MOST SERIOUS) BY DISABILITY

Factor MOST limit recrtment min	disabled		
	yes	no	Total
None	5	87	92
	23.81	26.61	26.44
ScarcMem	5	70	75
	23.81	21.41	21.55
LackSpec	1	15	16
	4.76	4.59	4.60
LessQual	0	10	10
	0.00	3.06	2.87
InsufInt	2	24	26
	9.52	7.34	7.47
MoreTime	0	32	32
	0.00	9.79	9.20
OvertPre	1	31	32
	4.76	9.48	9.20
ImplDisc	5	38	43
	23.81	11.62	12.36
Other#1	1	10	11
	4.76	3.06	3.16
Other#2	1	10	11
	4.76	3.06	3.16
Total	21	327	348
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(9) = 6.1485 Prob>chi2 = 0.725

TABLE 5: CROSSTABS (Q12A - "MOST SERIOUS) BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Factor MOST limit recrtment min	manage		
	Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
None	4 8.89	90 29.22	94 26.63
ScarcMem	20 44.44	57 18.51	77 21.81
LackSpec	3 6.67	12 3.90	15 4.25
LessQual	0 0.00	10 3.25	10 2.83
InsufInt	2 4.44	23 7.47	25 7.08
MoreTime	6 13.33	26 8.44	32 9.07
OvertPre	6 13.33	26 8.44	32 9.07
ImplDisc	3 6.67	42 13.64	45 12.75
Other#1	0 0.00	11 3.57	11 3.12
Other#2	1 2.22	11 3.57	12 3.40
Total	45 100.00	308 100.00	353 100.00

chi2(9) = 26.2687 Prob>chi2 = 0.002

TABLE 6: CROSSTABS (Q12B - "NEXT MOST SERIOUS") BY RACE

Fact NEXT MOST limit rctmnt min	race					
	asian	hispanic	black	white	other	Total
None	18	8	10	64	13	113
	30.51	25.81	23.26	35.36	44.83	32.94
ScarcMem	6	2	3	24	2	37
	10.17	6.45	6.98	13.26	6.90	10.79
LackSpec	3	4	1	26	3	37
	5.08	12.90	2.33	14.36	10.34	10.79
LessQual	5	0	2	11	0	18
	8.47	0.00	4.65	6.08	0.00	5.25
InsufInt	8	1	7	9	3	28
	13.56	3.23	16.28	4.97	10.34	8.16
MoreTime	5	6	7	16	2	36
	8.47	19.35	16.28	8.84	6.90	10.50
OvertPre	8	6	8	10	3	35
	13.56	19.35	18.60	5.52	10.34	10.20
ImplDisc	4	0	3	8	2	17
	6.78	0.00	6.98	4.42	6.90	4.96
Other#1	0	3	0	5	0	8
	0.00	9.68	0.00	2.76	0.00	2.33
Other#2	2	1	2	8	1	14
	3.39	3.23	4.65	4.42	3.45	4.08
Total	59	31	43	181	29	343
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(36) = 54.3943 Prob>chi2 = 0.025

TABLE 7: CROSSTABS (Q12B - "NEXT MOST SERIOUS") BY GENDER

Fact NEXT MOST limit rctmnt min	sex		
	Male	Female	Total
None	44	76	120
	30.56	36.36	33.99
ScarcMem	16	23	39
	11.11	11.00	11.05
LackSpec	21	15	36
	14.58	7.18	10.20
LessQual	9	9	18
	6.25	4.31	5.10
InsufInt	12	16	28
	8.33	7.66	7.93
MoreTime	14	22	36
	9.72	10.53	10.20
OvertPre	12	25	37
	8.33	11.96	10.48
ImplDisc	6	11	17
	4.17	5.26	4.82
Other#1	4	4	8
	2.78	1.91	2.27
Other#2	6	8	14
	4.17	3.83	3.97
Total	144	209	353
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(9) = 7.7570 Prob>chi2 = 0.559

TABLE 8: CROSSTABS (Q12B - "NEXT MOST SERIOUS") BY DISABILITY

Fact NEXT MOST limit rctmnt min	disabled yes	no	Total
None	5 23.81	108 33.75	113 33.14
ScarcMem	0 0.00	37 11.56	37 10.85
LackSpec	3 14.29	31 9.69	34 9.97
LessQual	1 4.76	16 5.00	17 4.99
InsufInt	2 9.52	26 8.13	28 8.21
MoreTime	4 19.05	33 10.31	37 10.85
OvertPre	2 9.52	36 11.25	38 11.14
ImplDisc	1 4.76	16 5.00	17 4.99
Other#1	1 4.76	7 2.19	8 2.35
Other#2	2 9.52	10 3.13	12 3.52
Total	21 100.00	320 100.00	341 100.00

chi2(9) = 7.7732 Prob>chi2 = 0.557

TABLE 9: CROSSTABS (Q12B - "NEXT MOST SERIOUS") BY MANAGEMENT STATUS

Fact NEXT MOST limit rctmnt min	manage Managemt	NonMgmt	Total
None	8 17.39	107 35.55	115 33.14
ScarcMem	8 17.39	29 9.63	37 10.66
LackSpec	10 21.74	27 8.97	37 10.66
LessQual	2 4.35	16 5.32	18 5.19
InsufInt	1 2.17	28 9.30	29 8.36
MoreTime	8 17.39	28 9.30	36 10.37
OvertPre	4 8.70	33 10.96	37 10.66
ImplDisc	4 8.70	13 4.32	17 4.90
Other#1	0 0.00	8 2.66	8 2.31
Other#2	1 2.17	12 3.99	13 3.75
Total	46 100.00	301 100.00	347 100.00

chi2(9) = 20.6623 Prob>chi2 = 0.014

PART 15

SELECTED FREQUENCIES AND CROSSTABS BY LENGTH OF SERVICE AT SFSU

Table 1: Frequency distribution (Q20): length of service at SFSU 1
Table 2: Crosstab: race by length of service 1
Table 3: Crosstab: sex by length of service 2
Table 4: Crosstab: sexual identity by length of service 2
Table 5: Crosstab: disability by length of service 2
Table 6: Crosstab: religion by length of service 3
Table 7: Crosstab: management status by length of service 3
Table 8: Crosstab: permanent/temporary status by length of service 4
Table 9: Crosstabs: (Q2) personal abuse based on ... by length of service

Gender 4
Race 5
Sexual orientation 5
Religion 6
Disability 6
National origin 7

Table 10: Crosstab: (Q11) Opinion Affirmative Action by length of service 7
Table 11: Crosstab: Q9) Opinion hire more minorities by length of service 8
Table 12: Crosstab: (Q10) Opinion do more to reduce discrimination by length of service 9
Table 13: Crosstab: (Q13A) Opinion top administration committed by length of service 10
Table 14: Crosstab: Q13B by length of service 11
Table 15: Crosstab: Q13C by length of service 12
Table 16: Crosstab: Q13D by length of service 13
Table 17: Crosstab: Q13E by length of service 14
Table 18: Crosstab: Q13F by length of service 15
Table 19: Crosstab: Q13G by length of service 16
Table 20: Crosstab: (Q13H) Opinion managers sensitive to multicultural groups by length of service 17
Table 21: Crosstab: (Q5) Personally sexually harassed by length of service (females only) 17

TABLE 1: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION (Q20): LENGTH OF SERVICE AT SFSU

Length of Service at SFSU	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
< 6 yrs	187	47.58	47.58
6+ yrs	206	52.42	100.00
Total	393	100.00	

TABLE 2: CROSSTAB: RACE BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

race	Length of Service at SFSU < 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
asian	33	33	66
	18.54	16.67	17.55
hispanic	10	23	33
	5.62	11.62	8.78
black	25	23	48
	14.04	11.62	12.77
white	95	102	197
	53.37	51.52	52.39
other	15	17	32
	8.43	8.59	8.51
Total	178	198	376
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 4.5273 Prob>chi2 = 0.339

TABLE 3: CROSSTAB SEX BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

sex	Length of Service at SFSU < 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
Male	72	80	152
	39.13	39.60	39.38
Female	112	122	234
	60.87	60.40	60.62
Total	184	202	386
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 0.0090 Prob>chi2 = 0.924

TABLE 4: CROSSTAB SEXUAL IDENTITY BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

gaybi	Length of Service at SFSU < 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
Gay/Bi	37	25	62
	21.26	13.23	17.08
Straight	137	164	301
	78.74	86.77	82.92
Total	174	189	363
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 4.1317 Prob>chi2 = 0.042

TABLE 5: CROSSTAB DISABILITY BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

disabled	Length of Service at SFSU < 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
yes	8	13	21
	4.52	6.63	5.63
no	169	183	352
	95.48	93.37	94.37
Total	177	196	373
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 0.7815 Prob>chi2 = 0.377

TABLE 6: CROSSTAB RELIGION BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

relig	Length of Service at SFSU < 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
Christn	79	104	183
	46.47	53.33	50.14
Jewish	11	8	19
	6.47	4.10	5.21
Islamic	1	1	2
	0.59	0.51	0.55
None	60	59	119
	35.29	30.26	32.60
Other	19	23	42
	11.18	11.79	11.51
Total	170	195	365
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 2.5781 Prob>chi2 = 0.631

TABLE 7: CROSSTAB MANAGEMENT STATUS BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

manage	Length of Service at SFSU < 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
Managemt	14	33	47
	7.78	16.75	12.47
NonMgmt	166	164	330
	92.22	83.25	87.53
Total	180	197	377
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 6.9405 Prob>chi2 = 0.008

TABLE 8: CROSSTAB PERMANENT/TEMPORARY STATUS BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

Permanent Status?	Length of Service at SFSU < 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
yes	119	184	303
	64.67	92.00	78.91
no	65	16	81
	35.33	8.00	21.09
Total	184	200	384
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 42.9938 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

TABLE 9: CROSSTABS (Q2 - PERSONAL EXPERIENCE OF ABUSE BASED ON...) BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

. GENDER

Abused based on gender?	Length of Service at SFSU < 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
Never	86	94	180
	47.25	46.53	46.88
Rarely	35	42	77
	19.23	20.79	20.05
Sometime	51	50	101
	28.02	24.75	26.30
Often	10	16	26
	5.49	7.92	6.77
Total	182	202	384
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 1.3484 Prob>chi2 = 0.718

. RACE

Abused based on race/ethnicity?	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
Never	90	95	185
	49.45	46.57	47.93
Rarely	40	47	87
	21.98	23.04	22.54
Sometime	48	49	97
	26.37	24.02	25.13
Often	4	13	17
	2.20	6.37	4.40
Total	182	204	386
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 4.2332 Prob>chi2 = 0.237

. SEXUAL ORIENTATION

Abused based on sexual identity	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
Never	124	145	269
	68.13	71.78	70.05
Rarely	29	29	58
	15.93	14.36	15.10
Sometime	22	21	43
	12.09	10.40	11.20
Often	7	7	14
	3.85	3.47	3.65
Total	182	202	384
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 0.6227 Prob>chi2 = 0.891

. RELIGION

Abused based on Relig. Faith?	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
Never	138	159	297
	77.53	79.10	78.36
Rarely	32	28	60
	17.98	13.93	15.83
Sometime	6	11	17
	3.37	5.47	4.49
Often	2	3	5
	1.12	1.49	1.32
Total	178	201	379
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 2.0338 Prob>chi2 = 0.565

. DISABILITY

Abused based on disability?	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
Never	157	172	329
	89.71	86.87	88.20
Rarely	11	19	30
	6.29	9.60	8.04
Sometime	5	4	9
	2.86	2.02	2.41
Often	2	3	5
	1.14	1.52	1.34
Total	175	198	373
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 1.7166 Prob>chi2 = 0.633

. NATIONAL ORIGINS

Abused based on national origin	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
Never	133	137	270
	73.89	68.16	70.87
Rarely	23	31	54
	12.78	15.42	14.17
Sometime	21	28	49
	11.67	13.93	12.86
Often	3	5	8
	1.67	2.49	2.10
Total	180	201	381
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 1.5918 Prob>chi2 = 0.661

TABLE 10: CROSSTAB (Q11 - AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS IMPROVED?) BY
. LENGTH OF SERVICE

SFSU Affirm Act Prog Improved?	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
Improved	40	69	109
	21.62	33.66	27.95
Same	29	66	95
	15.68	32.20	24.36
Worsened	22	26	48
	11.89	12.68	12.31
NoBasis	94	44	138
	50.81	21.46	35.38
Total	185	205	390
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(3) = 39.6540 Prob>chi2 = 0.000

. TABLE 11: CROSSTAB (Q9 -- AGREE/DISAGREE MANAGERS SHOULD DO MORE TO RECRUIT, HIRE MINORITIES?) BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

Mgrs do more Rct, Hire, minorit	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
StrAgree	73	76	149
	42.44	38.38	40.27
ModAgree	35	44	79
	20.35	22.22	21.35
Neither	31	32	63
	18.02	16.16	17.03
ModDisag	19	25	44
	11.05	12.63	11.89
StrDisag	14	21	35
	8.14	10.61	9.46
Total	172	198	370
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 1.5002 Prob>chi2 = 0.827

TABLE 12: CROSSTAB (Q10 - AGREE/DISAGREE MANAGERS SHOULD DO MORE TO REDUCE DISCRIMINATION & INTOLERANCE?) BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

Mgrs do more reduce discrim/int	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
StrAgree	94 53.41	122 61.93	216 57.91
ModAgree	40 22.73	38 19.29	78 20.91
Neither	33 18.75	24 12.18	57 15.28
ModDisag	7 3.98	7 3.55	14 3.75
StrDisag	2 1.14	6 3.05	8 2.14
Total	176 100.00	197 100.00	373 100.00

chi2(4) = 5.9385 Prob>chi2 = 0.204

TABLE 13: CROSSTAB (Q13A - AGREE/DISAGREE TOP ADMINISTRATION GENUINELY COMMITTED?) BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

Top Adm Genuinely Committed	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
StrAgree	35	41	76
	18.92	20.30	19.64
ModAgree	60	60	120
	32.43	29.70	31.01
Neither	39	35	74
	21.08	17.33	19.12
ModDisag	35	32	67
	18.92	15.84	17.31
StrDisag	16	34	50
	8.65	16.83	12.92
Total	185	202	387
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 6.5701 Prob>chi2 = 0.160

TABLE 14: CROSSTAB Q13B BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

Discrim at SFSU by Small Min	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
StrAgree	36	56	92
	19.46	27.59	23.71
ModAgree	56	61	117
	30.27	30.05	30.15
Neither	35	23	58
	18.92	11.33	14.95
ModDisag	40	38	78
	21.62	18.72	20.10
StrDisag	18	25	43
	9.73	12.32	11.08
Total	185	203	388
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 7.4160 Prob>chi2 = 0.115

TABLE 15: CROSSTAB Q13C BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

Too Much Emph on Group Diff's	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
StrAgree	63	81	144
	34.05	40.10	37.21
ModAgree	54	46	100
	29.19	22.77	25.84
Neither	37	40	77
	20.00	19.80	19.90
ModDisag	22	24	46
	11.89	11.88	11.89
StrDisag	9	11	20
	4.86	5.45	5.17
Total	185	202	387
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 2.5520 Prob>chi2 = 0.635

TABLE 16: CROSSTAB Q13D BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

SFSU Hum Rel Relatively Good	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
StrAgree	30	36	66
	16.22	17.82	17.05
ModAgree	65	80	145
	35.14	39.60	37.47
Neither	41	48	89
	22.16	23.76	23.00
ModDisag	36	26	62
	19.46	12.87	16.02
StrDisag	13	12	25
	7.03	5.94	6.46
Total	185	202	387
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 3.5607 Prob>chi2 = 0.469

TABLE 17: CROSSTAB Q13E BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

SFSU Shld Not Restrict Speech	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
StrAgree	37	41	78
	20.00	20.92	20.47
ModAgree	31	32	63
	16.76	16.33	16.54
Neither	24	24	48
	12.97	12.24	12.60
ModDisag	37	35	72
	20.00	17.86	18.90
StrDisag	56	64	120
	30.27	32.65	31.50
Total	185	196	381
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 0.4927 Prob>chi2 = 0.974

TABLE 18: CROSSTAB Q13F BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

Affirm Action Lowers Quality	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
StrAgree	36	40	76
	19.46	19.80	19.64
ModAgree	32	45	77
	17.30	22.28	19.90
Neither	29	20	49
	15.68	9.90	12.66
ModDisag	29	30	59
	15.68	14.85	15.25
StrDisag	59	67	126
	31.89	33.17	32.56
Total	185	202	387
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 3.8439 Prob>chi2 = 0.428

TABLE 19: CROSSTAB Q13G BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

White Males Equally Mistreated	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
StrAgree	15	25	40
	8.15	12.32	10.34
ModAgree	28	34	62
	15.22	16.75	16.02
Neither	27	35	62
	14.67	17.24	16.02
ModDisag	47	36	83
	25.54	17.73	21.45
StrDisag	67	73	140
	36.41	35.96	36.18
Total	184	203	387
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 4.9069 Prob>chi2 = 0.297

TABLE 20: CROSSTAB (Q13H -- MANAGERS SENSITIVE TO MULTICULTURAL GROUPS?) BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

Mgrs Sensitive to Multicult Grp	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
StrAgree	22	19	41
	11.89	9.36	10.57
ModAgree	53	58	111
	28.65	28.57	28.61
Neither	50	54	104
	27.03	26.60	26.80
ModDisag	44	41	85
	23.78	20.20	21.91
StrDisag	16	31	47
	8.65	15.27	12.11
Total	185	203	388
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(4) = 4.6667 Prob>chi2 = 0.323

TABLE 21: CROSSTAB (Q5 - PERSONALLY SEXUALLY HARASSED) BY LENGTH OF SERVICE (FEMALES ONLY)

-> sex= Female

Experience Sexual Harassment?	Length of Service at SFSU		
	< 6 yrs	6+ yrs	Total
yes	14	23	37
	12.50	19.33	16.02
no	98	96	194
	87.50	80.67	83.98
Total	112	119	231
	100.00	100.00	100.00

chi2(1) = 1.9995 Prob>chi2 = 0.157

Human Relations

Staff/Administrator Survey

Public Research Institute

San Francisco State University

Return to:

Public Research Institute
C/O Department of Political Science
SCI 379

NOTE: As you think about these questions, please remember that your answers will be **anonymous**. It is very important for SFSU's Human Relations Commission to learn what staff and administrators actually think and feel about these issues. Please base your answers on your experiences and observations since you began working at SFSU. Please do your best to give **frank** answers.

Q1. The basic mission of the Human Relations Commission is to find out whether people at San Francisco State University are treated differently based on their race, ethnicity, religion, national origins, gender, sexual identity, or disabilities. In general, would you say that members of the following groups are treated **better**, **about the same**, or **worse** than the average person at SFSU by other members of the campus community? Please check one box in each row.

	Better	About Same	Worse	Don't Know
Arabs	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Asians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Pacific Islanders	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Blacks/African Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Hispanics/Latinos/Chicanos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Native Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Filipinos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Whites	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Men	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Women	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Gays/Lesbians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Fundamentalist Christians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Jews	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Muslims	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Disabled	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Foreigners	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q2. As a staff/administrator at SFSU, how often, if at all, have you been <u>offended, put down, or physically or emotionally abused</u> in any way by other members of the campus community on the basis of your ... <u>Check one box in each row.</u>

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Gender?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Race/Ethnicity?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Sexual orientation?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Religious beliefs?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Disability?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
National origins?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q3. How often, if at all, have you <u>personally experienced</u> each of the following forms of discrimination based on a group characteristic (i.e., race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, disability, religion)? <u>Check one box in each row.</u>

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Negative remarks by co-workers	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Negative remarks by faculty	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Negative remarks by managers	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Social behavior by co-workers that tends to exclude	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Behavior by students that expresses negative attitudes	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Behavior by staff or co-workers that expresses negative attitudes	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Departmental patterns of interaction and influence, including work assignments, that tend to exclude or disadvantage	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Less desirable work assignments	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Inequitable approaches to hiring, retention, or advancement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q4. How often, if at all, have you **directly observed** each of the following forms of discrimination **toward a co-worker** based on a group characteristic (i.e., race or ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, disability, religion)? **Check one box in each row.**

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often
Negative remarks by co-workers	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Negative remarks by faculty	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Negative remarks by managers	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Social behavior by co-workers that tends to exclude	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Behavior by students that expresses negative attitudes	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Behavior by staff or co-workers that expresses negative attitudes	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Departmental patterns of interaction and influence, including work assignments, that tend to exclude or disadvantage	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Less desirable work assignments	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Inequitable approaches to hiring, retention, or advancement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q5. **Sexual harassment** is "a person's use of University authority, rank, or position to make sexual advances, request sexual favors, or engage in other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature." By this definition, have **you yourself** ever been sexually harassed on this campus?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

Q6. Do you know **any staff/administrator** who has been sexually harassed?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

Q7. In your opinion, are persons in each of the following groups advantaged or disadvantaged in <u>hiring decisions</u> by your department? <u>Check one box in each row.</u>

	Advantaged	No Difference	Disadvantaged	Don't Know
Arabs	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Asians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Pacific Islanders	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Blacks/African Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Hispanics/Latinos/ Chicanos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Native Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Filipinos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Whites	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Men	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Women	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Gays/Lesbians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Fundamentalist Christians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Jews	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Muslims	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Disabled	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Foreigners	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q8. In your opinion, are persons in each of the following groups advantaged or disadvantaged in <u>appointments to management positions</u> in the University? <u>Check one box in each row.</u>

	Advantaged	No Difference	Disadvantaged	Don't Know
Arabs	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Asians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Pacific Islanders	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Blacks/African Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Hispanics/Latinos/ Chicanos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Native Americans	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Filipinos	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Whites	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Men	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Women	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Gays/Lesbians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Fundamentalist Christians	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Jews	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Muslims	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Disabled	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
Foreigners	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q9. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement: **"Managers should take a more active role than they they do now in furthering the recruitment, hiring, and retention of minority staff and management."**

Strongly agree	[ ]
Moderately agree	[ ]
Neither agree nor disagree	[ ]
Moderately disagree	[ ]
Strongly disagree	[ ]
Don't know, no opinion	[ ]

Q10. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statement: **"Managers should take a more active role than they do now in reducing intolerance and discrimination among staff."**

Strongly agree	[ ]
Moderately agree	[ ]
Neither agree nor disagree	[ ]
Moderately disagree	[ ]
Strongly disagree	[ ]
Don't know, no opinion	[ ]

Q11. Over the past five years, do you think SFSU's affirmative action programs have . . .

[ ] Improved

[ ] Stayed the Same

[ ] Gotten Worse

[ ] No Basis for Judgment

Q12. Please consider whether each factor listed below **limits recruitment of new staff or managers** in your department. If you think a listed factor does limit recruitment from one or more of the specified groups, check the box(es) for that factor in the appropriate column(s).

FACTOR	Does the listed factor limit recruitment from...? People of Color	Women	Disabled People
A. Scarcity of members of this group with skills in my classification.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
B. Members of this group lack specialties needed in my classification.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
C. Members of this group tend to be less qualified than white males in my classification.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
D. Insufficient interest in my department to hire members of this group.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
E. Finding qualified people in this group takes more time and effort than finding qualified white males.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
F. Overt prejudice and discrimination by people involved in recruiting or hiring.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
G. Implicit and/or institutional discrimination.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
H. OTHER_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
I. OTHER_____	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Q12A. In your judgment, which of these factors, if any, **most seriously** limits recruitment of new staff/administrators from the groups named above (A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, or "none")?

Answer:_____

Q12B. In your judgment, which of these factors, if any, **next most** seriously limits recruitment of new staff/administrators from the groups named above (A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, or "none")?

Answer:_____

Q13. What follows are statements of opinion about life at San Francisco State University. Some staff/administrators agree with these opinions, others disagree. We want to know what you think.

A. "The top administration (President, Vice Presidents, Deans) is genuinely committed to promoting multiracial understanding and cooperation at SFSU."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

B. "Incidents of discrimination and prejudice at S. F. State are caused by a very small number of people and do not reflect the beliefs and attitudes of the majority."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

C. "People on this campus spend too much time emphasizing their differences with people of other groups (that is, of other races, religions, etc.) rather than exploring values and goals they have in common."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

D. "Compared to what I see and hear off-campus, human relations among different groups on-campus at S. F. State are relatively good."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

E. "The University should not restrict my right to say publicly anything I want about members of other groups, even if what I say might be regarded as offensive or insulting."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

F. "Too much emphasis on affirmative action in hiring and retention carries a risk of lowering the quality of staff/administrators at SFSU."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

G. "White male staff/administrators at SFSU face at least as much prejudice and intolerance as any other group."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

H. "Managers on campus are generally sensitive to the needs of multicultural groups on campus."

[ ] Strongly Agree
[ ] Moderately Agree
[ ] Neither Agree nor Disagree
[ ] Moderately Disagree
[ ] Strongly Disagree

Q14. If you had convincing evidence of an instance of discrimination against yourself or a co-worker, do you know what steps you would take to deal with it?

[ ] Yes ----------

[ ] No

Q14A. If "yes," what would those steps be? _____
_____
_____

Q15. Do you feel adequate procedures are in place at SFSU to deal with complaints about prejudice or discrimination against staff/ administrators?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No

[ ] Don't know, not sure.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

So that we can see how your opinions compare with those of other staff and administrators at SFSU, we'd like a few facts about you. Again, please remember that all of your answers are **anonymous**.

Q16. Are you ... ? [ ] Male [ ] Female

Q17. What is your age? _____ years.

Q18. What is your collective bargaining unit?

[ ] Don't Know

[ ] Unit 1 - Physicians
[ ] Unit 2 - Health Care Support
[ ] Unit 4 - Academic Support
[ ] Unit 5 - Operations Support
[ ] Unit 6 - Skilled Crafts
[ ] Unit 7 - Clerical/Administrative Support
[ ] Unit 8 - Public Safety
[ ] Unit 9 - Technical Support Services
[ ] Management

Q19. Do you have permanent status? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Q20. How many years have you worked as a staff/administrator at SFSU?

_____ Years

Q21. Please indicate each diploma and degree that you hold, if any. Check all that apply.

[ ] High School Diploma
[ ] Baccalaureate
[ ] Master's
[ ] Doctorate
[ ] Other (Please specify_____)

Q22. Do you have any disability?

[ ] Yes -----↓
[ ] No

Q22A. If yes, please describe:

_____
_____
_____

Q23. If you were to describe your own ethnic, racial, or cultural identification to a friend, what words would you use?

_____

Q24. For classification purposes, we'd like to know what race or ethnic group you identify with. (The following categories are taken from the University's federal Affirmative Action report.) (Check one box.)

[ ] Filipino
[ ] Asian
[ ] Pacific Islander
[ ] Mexican-American
[ ] Hispanic
[ ] American Indian
[ ] Black non-Hispanic
[ ] White non-Hispanic
[ ] Other (Describe: _____)

Q25. What is your religous preference, if any? Is it Christian, Jewish, Islamic, some other religion, or no religion? (Check one box.)

[ ] Christian
[ ] Jewish
[ ] Islamic
[ ] None
[ ] Other (Describe: _____)

Q25A. If you answered "Christian" to Q25, would you describe yourself as a Fundamentalist Christian? (Skip to Q26 if not applicable.)

[ ] Yes
[ ] No

Q26. Are you... ? (Check one box.)

[ ] Heterosexual
[ ] Gay or lesbian
[ ] Bisexual

Your answers to these last questions will help the Human Relations Commission evaluate responsiveness to its requests for evidence and testimony about discriminatory or insensitive actions on this campus.

Q27. Were you aware that the Human Relations Commission held hearings on campus to receive evidence about instances of prejudice or discrimination?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No (PLEASE SKIP TO Q28.)

Q27A. (If Yes) Did you submit evidence to the Human Relations Commission?

[ ] Yes (PLEASE SKIP TO Q28.)

[ ] No

Q27B. (If No to Q27A) Did you **consider** submitting evidence to the Human Relations Commission or appearing at one of the Commission's hearings, but decide not to do so?

[ ] Yes

[ ] No (PLEASE SKIP TO Q28.)

Q27C. (If Yes to Q27B) Please explain why you decided not to submit evidence or appear at a hearing.

_____
_____
_____

Q28. Using the format below, please give examples of what you believe were discriminatory or insensitive actions, if any, which you have observed on this campus.

[ ] Check this box if you have observed no such actions on this campus.

[ ] Check this box if you have observed such actions on this campus but are unable or unwilling to provide specific examples.

FORMAT FOR EXAMPLES:

Incident #1:

TYPE: (related to race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, sexual identiy/orientation, disability)
_____

BRIEF DESCRIPTION: _____
_____
_____

ACTION YOU TOOK, IF ANY: _____
_____

RESPONSE YOU RECEIVED: _____
_____

SATISFACTION WITH RESOLUTION: _____
_____

IF DISSATISFIED, HOW WOULD YOU HAVE PREFERRED THE INCIDENT TO BE HANDLED AND RESOLVED? _____
_____

Incident #2:

TYPE: (related to race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, gender, sexual identiy/orientation, disability)
_____

BRIEF DESCRIPTION: _____
_____
_____

ACTION YOU TOOK, IF ANY: _____
_____

RESPONSE YOU RECEIVED: _____
_____

SATISFACTION WITH RESOLUTION: _____
_____

IF DISSATISFIED, HOW WOULD YOU HAVE PREFERRED THE INCIDENT TO BE HANDLED AND RESOLVED? _____
_____

(Use space below or reverse for additional examples.)

Please use the space below to write any additional thoughts or comments you would like to share with the members of the Human Relations Commission.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE!

Please use the envelope provided and return questionnaire through campus mail to:

Public Research Institute
c/o Department of Political Science
SCI 379

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 21,1991